FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Supplement

Soviet Union

Congress of People's Deputies Stenographic Record

FBIS-SOV-89-153-S
Thursday
10 August 1989

Soviet Union
SUPPLEMENT
Congress of People's Deputies
Stenographic Record

FBIS-SOV-89-153-S *10 August 1989*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: The Daily Report is publishing the full translation of IZVESTIYA's "stenographic record" of the Congress of People's Deputies. Additional supplements will be issued as translated material becomes available.

STENOGRAPHIC RECORD

Supreme Soviet Holds First Session 6 Jun *[IZVESTIYA 8 Jun]* 1

Supreme Soviet Holds First Session 6 Jun
PM0906100189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Jun 89 Morning Edition pp 6-10

["First Session of USSR Supreme Soviet: First Sitting of Soviet of Nationalities. Stenographic record."—IZVESTIYA headline]

[Text]

6 June 1989. Supreme Soviet Hall of Sessions in the Kremlin. 1600.

Comrade M.S. Gorbachev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, is in the chair.

M.S. Gorbachev: Since they have not yet reported to us how many people have been registered, and we must start our work like this, we will probably do what they did in the chamber of the Soviet of the Union. Wishes have already been expressed at the congress and lists have been compiled so that the person in the chair does not get up and "hang" over the speaker and over the presidium. In general this is the tradition in all forums that function on a permanent basis. Take the United Nations, the tradition of parliament and so forth. I have participated at many similar forums and have seen this and I therefore think that we may agree on this. We have a working process and correspondingly a working atmosphere. Let us resolve to work in this way.

Some 239 deputies have now been registered but they are still coming in, comrades, they are coming in, there are now 252.

First of all, before the session is opened I would like to congratulate you all, dear comrades, on your election by the 1st Congress of People's Deputies to the USSR Supreme Soviet and the chamber of the Soviet of Nationalities. And in this connection I would like to express two thoughts, two judgments. First it relates also to the congress, the Supreme Soviet, and the new government. Soviet people are expecting from the new organs of power a serious improvement in the work of all top echelons. They link this with an improvement in their activity and with more effective work in both the legislative and executive directions, and a serious solution to urgent problems and the advance of restructuring and real changes in our society. And you have probably been turning your attention and have sensed in these days how attentively the people are following all the sessions of the congress and what kind of response this is evoking. True, there is one negative factor, so they say: Things are such that many have even left their work places and are not working; they are watching their television sets. This, of course, is not quite good. We have advised our mass media to broadcast material on the congress sessions during the evening and night so that people can catch up on what they were unable to watch during work time. But this once again emphasizes that the people are interested in seeing that the new organs of power work fruitfully and efficiently. That is the first thing.

And the second. The special features of the work of the Soviet of Nationalities as one of the chambers of the Supreme Soviet is to a decisive degree connected with another circumstance, namely, that it is a question of the Supreme Soviet and one of its chambers in a federative state where so many nations and nationalities live and where for so many decades this enormous world has been looking for something better for each people and for ways to strengthen cooperation and interaction. Life states convincingly, and the congress has also shown this, that we have achieved much marching together as part of a federative state, helping each other, and strengthening and developing our cooperation. But certain causes associated with the deformations that were permitted on our path after the October—what I have in mind is economic processes and social processes and political processes—have also exerted a serious effect on interethnic relations and on the implementation of national policy. And it has come about that on the one hand, as a result of realization of the ideas of the October our people have moved onto a broad path of development and have advanced a long way in their socioeconomic and cultural development. This has been associated with the emergence of a national intelligentsia and with the development of a sense of worth in each people and each person, in each representative of each nation. The presence of a large number of the intelligentsia, including the scientific intelligentsia, has been accompanied by a situation in which each people has made an in-depth study of its own roots, its own historical past, of the peripeteia through which any given people has passed. And this is quite understandable. A people wants to know about its own past and it is concerned with the problems of the present and wants to predict its own future from the standpoint of of living conditions and from the standpoint of the development of its culture, language, and so forth. All of this is the living reality and we see how everything here is complex and how many of the problems intertwine here. And naturally this to a large extent determines the sense of responsibility and assumes a high level of work by the Soviet of Nationalities at this stage of restructuring, when we have set out on the path of really giving a true ring to Leninist national policy now in the context of present achievements and the present stage in the development of our society. It is perhaps one of the main sectors of restructuring and it is so important that I cannot agree with the words that were heard at the congress: "Well, let us not talk just about the union and mutual relations between the nations and nationalities but let us talk about restructuring and the economy!" I must say that this kind of formulation is incorrect. These mutual relations make up an inseparable and very important part of restructuring. Without them our union cannot live and develop and move ahead, and without them restructuring cannot live and gather strength.

These are the two brief points that I wanted to make so as to give a certain setting, so to speak, both to our work today and to today's session.

Accordingly, permit me after these words to invite you as members of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities to begin our work. At this session we must resolve the question, in accordance with the constitution, of a chairman for the Soviet of Nationalities and his deputies. But at the Council of Elders (those who were present will recall) we agreed to to approach this in a more democratic way: to resolve the question of chairman of the chamber at this session and then let the chairman talk with and make contacts with delegates and work out ideas at a subsequent session and introduce and present them. This is what was done in the Soviet of the Union and I think we may also proceed in this way here. It will be more correct, and thus right from our first step we shall immediately get the savor of the chamber itself.

We are agreed that Deputy Khudaybergenova will speak on the question of nominations for the post of chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities. Is she present or not? She is the deputy from Uzbekistan and a oblast party committee [obkom] first secretary.

R.M. Khudaybergenova, first secretary of the Uzbek Communist Party Khorezm Obkom, Urgench city (the Khivinskiy National-Territorial Electoral Okrug, the Uzbek SSR): Comrade deputies. On instructions from the Council of Elders I submit for your consideration a proposal to elect deputy Rafik Nishanovich Nishanov to the post of chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities.

Comrade Nishanov was born in 1926, an Uzbek, member of the CPSU since 1949; he has a higher education and is a candidate of historical sciences. He possesses great practical experience of work in party and soviet organs and has been elected chairman of the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet Presidium and deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

Comrade Nishanov has spent many years in diplomatic work. He is at present the first secretary of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee. He is principled and exacting both toward himself and to his subordinates and he has the ability to listen to others and draw correct conclusions. As a person he is responsive, and he is known for his kindness, simplicity, and accessibility.

M.S. Gorbachev: Fine, are there any questions? Well, the mission has been carried out and the wish of the Council of Elders has been conveyed to the deputies. Are there any opinions on the subject from the deputies?

Voice from the hall: Support him.

M.S. Gorbachev: Comrade Nishanov, please. Perhaps we should let them ask you and talk and then you perhaps can say something. First, are there any questions?

Voice from the hall: A question about the events in Fergana. What is your role, your line?

R.N. Nishanov, first secretary of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee, Tashkent city (the Leningradskiy National-Territorial Electoral Okrug, Uzbek SSR): First of all it must be stated that the events that have in recent days acquired an interethnic character started with petty domestic bickering. If we look at the history of the Turkic Meskhets living in the Fergana valley, then I would like to emphasize that 45 years ago the Uzbeks accepted the Turkic Meskhets as their own brothers and sisters and created for them all the conditions for life, prosperity, labor, and education.

M.S. Gorbachev: How many of them live there?

R.N. Nishanov: Some 60,000 Turkic Meskhets live in Uzbekistan. There are about 12,000 in the Fergana valley. They all have appropriate work, are surrounded with attention, and participate actively in all the organs of state power; they are members of the party committees and deputies in the local soviets. Everything was just fine.

In recent years, however, the Turkic Meskhets have repeatedly been making demands to be returned to their home lands. Recently in connection with the convening of the congress, these actions have been somewhat increased but the clashes started with a quite insignificant domestic quarrel when agricultural produce was being bought and sold. Because of the high prices one of the representatives of the Turkic Meskhets rudely turned on a women selling produce that she had grown. It ended up with him knocking over a tray on which strawberries had been placed, and the citizens present there regarded this as an insult and a scuffle followed. Later it was possible to halt the scuffle but after some time a small group of Turkic Meskhets attacked the local young people and one of them was killed. Steps were taken and all was quiet and for almost a week things appeared to be normal, and then after a week, quite unexpectedly for the local organs and for the Turkic Meskhets and the Uzbek section of the population, a large group of youths aged 15 to 16 up to 20 to 22, some of whom were intoxicated either with alcohol or narcotics and armed with sticks and so forth started to attack houses belonging to Turkic Meskhets. Whereupon outraged Uzbek youths armed with canes, chains, axes, and sticks beat up those who had carried out the attack and set fire to the houses of some Turkic Meskhets. This incident—an actual manifestation of vandalism—ended in tragedy. According to our figures, as of today about 50 people have been killed of whom, it has now been established, 35 or more were Turkic Meskhets, along with 10 Uzbeks, 1 Tajik, and 1 Russian, and one of the people restoring order was also a chance casualty. These events took place especially

between Uzbeks and Turkic Meskhets. During the time that the situation was out of control they succeeded in burning several houses. Emergency measures were instituted by all-union organs, republic organs, and republic and all-union Internal Affairs Ministry [MVD] forces and now full control has been reestablished. The Turkic Meskhets are either in places where they live permanently while the day before yesterday and yesterday we evacuated some of them to a military garrison and accommodated them in the barracks and provided them with the necessary domestic conditions, and they are now safe. In all regions where the clashes have occurred a curfew has been imposed in accordance with an ukase of the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. Proper order is being maintained.

Yesterday and today the atmosphere has not become further complicated. The situation is under control and we hope that local party, soviet, and administrative organs will succeed in finally localizing the situation and maintaining proper order.

I have been there and talked with Turkic Meskhets, both in their living quarter and with those whom we have located in the military garrison. On behalf of the party organization and all workers in the republic I condemn the vandalism by Uzbek youth and sympathize deeply with and ask the pardon of our brothers and sisters among the Turkic Meskhets. I think that we shall carry out our international duty to the full and create the necessary conditions for them.

In general the workers of Uzbekistan—Uzbeks, Russians, Tajiks, Kazakhs, Karakalpaks, Turkmen, and Kirghiz—who live on republic territory are hospitable, labor-loving, and modest people. I think that the acts of vandalism that we have seen are evoking general condemnation and have served for us to learn the appropriate lessons so that this kind of thing will never be repeated in the future.

M.S. Gorbachev: Please, continue your report.

Voice from the hall: Rafik Nishanovich, please tell us whether or not conflict situations on an interethnic basis have occurred previously in Uzbekistan and how you have succeeded in regulating these relations.

Voice from the hall: We cannot hear.

M.S. Gorbachev: This was the question: Have you previously seen conflicts on interethnic grounds and how were they regulated?

R.N. Nishanov: Similar isolated incidents have occurred but exclusively on some domestic basis. There have been no incidents on a nationalist basis. This is the first such incident on an interethnic basis.

From the hall: Rafik Nishanovich, we are electing you for a very important post. A person should be very objective. But you are such a person and we have great respect for you. In this connection I have no questions for you.... But I would ask one question. This mistake was made not by you, not by us, not by our generation, but you will have to correct it because glasnost and restructuring are giving us an opportunity to talk loudly about this also. You know very well what we are talking about: We are talking about those Tajiks in Bukhara and Samarkand who at one time were described as Uzbeks in their passports.

You are aware of this question. You have met with our leaders many times on this question. But the question remains, still unresolved. What is your opinion on how it will be resolved?

How do you see the further course of this situation?

R.N. Nishanov: I understand the question. Everyone knows that some of the Tajik population living in Uzbekistan have written "Uzbek" in their passports, while some of the Uzbeks living in Tajikistan have written "Tajik" in theirs. Both the leadership and the workers of Tajikistan and Uzbekistan and I share the same approach. Everyone must be given full right to do what he likes and write in his own nationality. In particular we applied this during the census. And moreover, as the first secretary of the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee Comrade Makhkamov stated from the rostrum of our congress, both we and the Tajik Government have appealed to the USSR Government to resolve this matter on a legal basis and issue some kind of instruction. I therefore think that there is no issue here, we have complete mutual understanding: A person has the right to write in whatever nationality he wishes. Please....

M.S. Gorbachev: Give him the microphone, that's right.

From the hall: We are well aware that making reference to V.I. Lenin and the USSR Constitution, we have declared the equality of all nations and peoples living on our territory, while at the same time (again making reference to the constitution) we distinguish four different political and legal statuses for the nations and peoples. How do you see the resolution of this question? It is definite nonsense, both political and legal. That is the first question.

The second is this, more particular. At the congress we have had some all-union republics speaking for the second and even third time—the representatives of the republic—while deputies from a whole series of autonomous republics have not yet spoken at all.

R.N. Nishanov: First the first question. Without going into the legal and other aspects raised by your question, I would limit myself to the following answer: All the nations and nationalities of the Soviet Union should be

guaranteed equal rights. In what form? This is still to be worked out. This is the business of our chamber. At the congress, of course, there is very sharp and principled talk about ways for our further development, and proposals are being worked out. Naturally, each person wants to discuss the painful issues that are in fact seen in all regions, in the republics, all the autonomous formations, and the desire of comrades to stand on the dais and explain their own views is quite understandable. I would not say that anyone should restrict the deputies from the national formations, it is simply that time does not allow everyone to speak. Some of the republics have been represented in the debates by two speakers and some by one, and some by five or six. This is simply because we have not devised a mechanism. Those speaking from the dais of the congress have rightly said that some mechanism must be devised to enable any autonomous formation or any national formation to feel that it is fully equal in all respects. I think that in this regard our chamber must gain experience from all the republics, all the autonomous formations and all the nations and set up some kinds of rules that would be written into the Rules, and then we would not be rude to each other.

M.S. Gorbachev: Are there any more questions, comrades? Please.

From the hall: I was reading and hearing about national equality way back in 1924. And from 1924 to this day nothing has been done. How will you correct these terrible mistakes?

R.N. Nishanov: Well, first I would like to say that I will not correct them, but we together will do this. With respect to 1924, I would like, if you will permit me, to divide our national policy as follows: the national policy pursued during the life of Vladimir Ilich Lenin, and national policy since Lenin. It seems to me that since the death of Vladimir Ilich Lenin national policy has been deformed. We say one thing but in practice hold to other principles. Along with what we have achieved (in fact every republic, every nation, every people does have its achievements) there have also been the grossest distortions, errors, and perversions. It seems to me that our chamber, as now in his opening remarks Mikhail Sergeyevich has rightly emphasized, simply faces an enormous amount of work in order to work out the juridical and legal and legislative bases and devise ways for economic, social, and cultural development so that regardless of the numerical strength of a nation or nationality it has all rights to the full exercise of its sovereignty and to its independence. That is how I would answer this.

M.S. Gorbachev: All right. Now, one minute, the deputy from Armenia has asked to speak. Ask your question, please.

A people's deputy (not introduced): Rafik Nishanovich, this question is addressed both to you and in general to all of us. National questions are very confusing and it is precisely these questions that are preventing us from engaging seriously in restructuring, dynamically and actively. All of us have a mass of problems, all-union problems, and this is holding us back. So that when we turn to some questions they say that there are 19 such problems in the Soviet Union. There might be 119, or 1,119. And this is like saying, for example, that we shall collect 19 patients and treat them all with the same medicine, aspirin, for example. But problems are different. It seems to me, therefore, that we cannot approach this in a stereotype way. In the same way that we approach each person so too should we approach the fate of each people, regardless of its numerical strength, and here we should proceed from the Leninist principle of the self-determination of nations.

During the process of our work shall we be able to carry out our very important mission all together and on the basis of good and just decisions? Or will we behave as usual, as we have for so many long years in our country, when the wounds were constantly being dusted over, while it was the wounds themselves that needed to be healed; because if we do not heal the wounds they will go deeper.... And in general our ship has not traveled far. What I would like is for you to recognize the reality and the complexity of the tasks that will be laid mainly on your shoulders. I think this because the thing we all want least is to play the role of statists, you understand? The people did not elect us for that. So I would like you to say how realistically you see the dynamics involved in resolving these questions.

R.N. Nishanov: Esteemed colleague, first of all I would like to perceive your question as a wish for the work of the chamber. If from this dais I right now offered some ways to resolve this question I would simply not have been serious in my approach to this extremely complex problem. I agree with you absolutely that there are very hard and difficult issues and deep wounds. We must heal them not only with aspirin, as you have said, but with all the means at our disposal. I think that our chamber represents virtually all the nations and nationalities of the Soviet Union and is able to work out ways, but of course, so questions that arise may be priority questions, and some may require a certain time to resolve. I think that if we are united then we can find practical ways. You and I are political figures, and we shall seek out political solutions for these quite delicate questions that trouble everyone.

M.S. Gorbachev: Please.

From the hall: This is my question: By what attributes, in your opinion, should a nation [natsiya] be distinguished from a nationality [narodnost], and, given successful implementation of Leninist national policy, can a developing nationality become a nation within the framework of the Soviet Union?

R.N. Nishanov: Thank you, colleague. You are all well aware that for many years we have been living with the Stalinist definition of nation. Naturally, this approach is now being reexamined both by the social scientists and by all of us together. Obviously, in the Soviet of Nationalities we will work for a solution to this question. But, I repeat, the social scientists must work on it. You and I are actively concerned that dogma does not take hold but that a creative approach is insured.

M.S. Gorbachev: Now I give the floor to the comrade there who has raised his hand. Ask your question.

I.Sh. Mashbashev, writer, secretary of the Adyge writers' organization, Maykop City (Shovgenovskiy National-Territorial Electoral Okrug, Adyge Autonomous Oblast): Rafik Nishanovich, when we discussed your nomination at the meeting of the Council of Elders, we, the representatives of the numerically small peoples of Russia, asked you questions. After a number of those questions one of the deputies, I do not recall his name (he was from the Baltic republics), stood up and asked this: "Why not first let people resolve their own questions in their own republics?" Will this not put pressure on the deputies for the small peoples of Russia? How do you see this?

M.S. Gorbachev: Incidentally.... I beg your pardon. While Rafik Nishanovich considers this let me say that at the meeting of the Council of Elders we agreed not to use the term "small" [malyy] nations but "numerically small." Because when the term "small" is used it gives the words a quite different shade of meaning.

R.N. Nishanov: I fully understand your anxiety. It seems to me that the comrade who asked that question made a slip in speaking and permitted an error.

From the hall: I think so, too.

R.N. Nishanov: Yes, please.

From the hall: Comrade deputies, permit me to ask a question in my own language, if you have no objection.

Rafik Nishanovich: .... (remainder of question delivered in national language).

R.N. Nishanov: This is a Kazakh speaking in the Uzbek-Kazakh language: "Comrades, respected colleague deputies, I would like to preface my question. Here we are electing you, or will elect you, for a high post. What do you think of all the nations and nationalities speaking in their own languages, and will it be possible for them to speak in their native tongues in the Supreme Soviet and at the congress?"

Now, should I answer this in Uzbek-Kazakh or Russian?

Voice from the hall: In Russian...

R.N. Nishanov: I think that first (and this was also discussed at the congress, in the report, and in many of the statements) all nations and all nationalities should be guaranteed the sovereign right to speak in their own native tongues. There should be no obstacles and no pinning on of labels on this account. With regard to our statements in our native tongues in the Supreme Soviet and at sessions of the chambers, or in the congress, you know that when it opened our first session the presidium issued instructions for the apparatus to carry out the necessary work to set up the technical facilities for simultaneous interpreting. I think that what you wish is correct, and it will be done.

From the hall: Esteemed Mikhail Sergeyevich. My first question is for you. We are electing a chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities without an alternative as I understand it. Is this correct?

M.S. Gorbachev: The Council of Elders put forward the nomination.

From the hall: So other deputies may still make nominations as I understand it, is this so? That was the first question. Now the second. Dear deputies! Let me address you in the Nanaian language (speaks in Nanaian). How are you, dear deputies? I wish you good health and happiness, and that success accompany you in your work. This is the first time that words in Nanaian have been heard within these walls, but this is my question (turns to R.N. Nishanov). I would very much like to ask you how you regard the international convention that was adopted in 1957 in Geneva on the indigenous and other population leading a tribal way of life, which was not signed or ratified here in this country, for which reason national policy in our country with respect to small peoples has in no way been considered. And I would like to ask you (if you become chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities) how you will help in resolving the national questions of the indigenous peoples of the Far East and of the North? For there is a tangle of national problems that for decades have not been resolved. And so I have two questions. On the convention adopted in 1957 in Geneva, and now, in June, a partial reexamination will take place. I would very much like to know your position on ratification and on whether we will be raising the question of its ratification.

R.N. Nishanov: Thank you. I fully understand your concern. To the first question, I would answer thus. In the work on proposals on the Soviet of Nationalities in its present composition, and in determining the functions of our chamber, we also defined the tasks on which we should work. Our chamber (if it is considered necessary) will study the 1957 Convention and draw up recommendations and submit them to the Supreme Soviet. And the Supreme Soviet, in the congress if that is the level required, or if not, in the Supreme Soviet, will

consider these questions under established procedure if this is acceptable for all the nations and nationalities of the Soviet Union. I am ready to participate actively in this matter.

And the second question, the problems of numerically small nationalities, are everywhere. They are there in the North, in the South, in the East, in the West. I shall therefore not say that we should take up the North and neglect the South otherwise the people from the South will accuse me of a one-sided approach. We must take up the question with all the numerically small nationalities so that they also can sense their own sovereignty and worth in the great brotherhood of peoples.

From the hall: I have two questions. First, it is common knowledge that the two chambers are equal and therefore it is not only national relations that will interest us. What issues do you think should be related to the competence of the union and which to the union republics? That is one question. The second is about the common European home. In this connection I would like to ask you to comment on the plans for integration of the European Economic Community from 1992.

R.N. Nishanov: First of all I fully agree with you that questions of the development of the nations and national relations and the economic, social, and cultural development of all the nations and nationalities, republics, and autonomous formations will be dealt with by the Soviet of the Union as well as by our chamber, when it considers plans for economic and social development and other problems. Second, we shall work in close contact with the Soviet of the Union and many issues will be resolved jointly. With regard to the functions....

From the hall: My question is....

R.N. Nishanov: I shall answer, and then if you are not satisfied you may ask for clarification.... With regard to the functions of the all-union and republic organs I think first that this question is in the stage of being worked on, and many aspects are known while others are being worked on. The draft general principles for restructuring of the leadership and the economic and social spheres in the union republics set forth a number of proposals. Work is still in progress on a law on local self-management and the local economy, in which this task will also be defined. You and I will obviously have to discuss these laws.

From the hall: What is your attitude toward these laws?

R.N. Nishanov: Most favorable.... And with respect to the program for the economic integration of the European Economic Community, I think that in time we shall be a little more free to devote one of our sessions to studying the experience of the European community. We have experience with CEMA and we have our own domestic experience. The European community really does have interesting experience and it deserves attention. And on this plane I support you.

M.S. Gorbachev: You have asked your question?

From the hall: I would like to ask another.

M.S. Gorbachev: No, wait a little.... If we are to have equality among peoples we should have some kind of equality between deputies. Wait a little.

From the hall: The course of the voting will depend on this.

M.S. Gorbachev: I think that you will not be offended if I stop your speaking. Please, your comrades also have their claims.

From the hall: I would like to express dissatisfaction with the responses of R.N. Nishanov because he has not provided a specific answer to a single question. This is what I would like to know. When you were asked about events in Fergana you started out by indicating what had occurred barely a week before the incident with the strawberries. Then a few days later some people intoxicated with alcohol or narcotics started some kind of march. And then this was all expressed in the murders of the population by another nationality. You said that you had been there to look into things. So I would now like you to answer specifically what precisely you looked into and what reasons you established for these disturbances. And tell us what the reason was: Was it strawberries or alcohol and narcotics, or was it national enmity? If it was national enmity based on national grounds then tell us specifically on what issues this incident occurred. Thank you.

R.N. Nishanov: I think that I answered quite reasonably and objectively, but whether or not my answer satisfied you is another matter. With respect to analysis of the deeper causes of this phenomenon, the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee and the republic government have set up a governmental commission headed by the chairman of the republic Council of Ministers Comrade Kadyrov, who is now at the site and looking into things. These are the kinds of questions that require an extremely careful and well-considered analysis and politically principled evaluation. I gave my evaluation in my response: I condemn this vandalism. And what is there here that does not satisfy you?

From the hall: (Inaudible).

M.S. Gorbachev: Please.

From the hall: Good day. Highly esteemed colleague, I would like to ask you two questions but in general they are not beside the point. Because, as you have rightly said (and I fully agree with you), we will all resolve together questions concerning national issues. And your

duty will be the chairmanship.... To be honest I would like to draw the attention of all my colleagues to how calmly you are doing this, and this is one of the most important of your functions in this noisy future chamber. And so I ask two questions, not suggestions, but questions of a procedural nature.

First, what is your position on the idea itself of establishing a right of veto for the republics, national okrugs, and so forth on questions that affect the vital interests of a republic, autonomous republic, autonomous oblast, or national okrug? That is, your attitude toward this proposal.

And second, what is your position on the following idea: We shall have a chairman and two deputies. We have 15 union republics. It is a question of rotation once a year, that is, each year the three people will be replaced, so that in 5 years all the republics will have been represented. What do you think of this? Thank you.

R.N. Nishanov: Esteemed colleague, first with respect to the right of veto. We can take advice on this question, of course, but based on international practice I would say that as far as I know the right of veto is used in international organizations because significant forces are represented there that represent different countries with different social systems, different views on life, and different approaches to the resolution of particular issues. When the UN Charter was being drawn up, this principle was enunicated to prevent infringement on anyone's rights. But until now we have not had a situation here in which we could not reach agreement on a voluntary basis, and in which some right of veto had to prevail. Accordingly, as I stand here at this moment on this dais, I think that we have no need for it. But if anyone has different approaches or other grounds and can show them, then we shall discuss it in the chamber.

M.S. Gorbachev: Please, your second question.

R.N. Nishanov: The second question?

M.S. Gorbachev: Rotation.

R.N. Nishanov: Yes, rotation. Here, you and I are legislators. At present we have one law, which states that a chairman is elected. We shall be guided by that. But in principle I allow of and could support such an approach. There could be rotation since all the republics have the same rights, the autonomous republics also. And anyone sitting here in the hall could be chairman of the chamber. I support this idea.

M.S. Gorbachev: Please.

From the hall: At the congress the question of the small peoples like the Crimean Tatars has been repeatedly raised....

M.S. Gorbachev: Numerically small peoples....

From the hall: Yes, forgive me, numerically small peoples like the Crimean Tatars, the Povolzhye Germans, the Gagauz and others. There are also numerous interethnic problems in the Baltic republics. Tell us, please, do you have your own concept of how to resolve these questions? That is the first question. The second is: In the Baltic republics, because of economic troubles and disagreements on national grounds, it has been decided in the interests of protecting their own languages to declare them official languages. Can you tell us what your position is on this kind of state of affairs?

R.N. Nishanov: Let me answer the first question. Of course, the justice with respect to those national groups that have been deprived of their native places or their own formation should be restored. This is a principled approach. When and and what form—here we must probably give due consideration to real conditions. But the question does exist and ways must be found, including in our chamber.

The second question: Who, where and how can a native language be declared an official language and used in an institution in any particular place and so forth? This is a full sovereign right of each republic. I see no restrictions here but transferring some form from one republic to another I deem inadvisable. Let each republic resolve it for itself. This is my general approach in principle. You have declared your own language the official language, other republics have submitted draft laws declaring their own languages the official languages, and so forth. This work continues. I support this process in principle, but at the same time I would like to emphasize that when in any republic the native language is declared the official language, no infringement on other languages should be permitted. In each republic the best conditions should be guaranteed for the free use of any languages, in teaching, in cultural dealings, in production, in the state service, and so forth. I think that if these aspects are observed then the interests of all nations and nationalities will be served, no matter where they may live.

M.S. Gorbachev: You have been wanting to speak for a long time....

From the hall: I should make a short statement. Many of our voters have been pleased about the way in which you chaired one of the congress sessions. On Saturday and Sunday we met with Muscovites, young and middle aged, and they also were pleased. Many even suggested that you should be recommended for the post of chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities. In this connection I have a question: Is this your own regular style for dealing with people, or has the position of chairman obliged you to this? (Laughter in the hall).

This is my second question: As my colleague from the Baltic has said, we must evidently deal not only with interethnic relations but also the socioeconomic development of the republics, krays and so forth. How do you regard the development of power engineering today,

when nuclear power engineering has been branded, hydroelectric power has been branded, and thermal power stations have been branded—how will we now light our lamps? How do you see the development of power engineering?

R.N. Nishanov: Dealing with people, finding contacts, not exacerbating relations, living in friendship and harmony—there are inner needs for me. I think in general that one of the greatest virtues of an individual is never to lose his desire to learn. To learn from others, from people, from life. And if this is the case any person can feel free, and a person speaking with him also feels this freedom. Thank you for the compliment. At the congress I carried out the duties of presidium member and proceeded from the premise that the interests of all those present in the hall should be represented and that no one should feel offended. If I succeeded in doing that then I am very thankful.

With respect to the development of power engineering: of course, some distortions have been permitted and our economists and power engineering experts must probably, along with Gosplan experts and experts from all the republics and regions make a very careful study of this question. On the one hand our entire development is is based on power engineering and we cannot discard it. On the other hand, we must solve this problem in such a way that we do no harm nature or the ecology or people's lives. And so it still is that in some places people suffer from energy when they should be gaining joy from it. This is how the question is posed. We shall have to be up to participating in this process so as to devise sensible ways.

M.S. Gorbachev: Please.

From the hall: Very many questions have been asked here of Rafik Nishanovich. I think that it is the first time in his life that he has answered so many questions, it has never happened before. I know him well. We are neighbors. I must honestly admit that before he came we had major problems between the Tajik SSR and the Uzbek SSR, very great problems. After his appointment, or more accurately, first his election to the post of chairman of the republic Supreme Soviet Presidium and then first secretary of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee, he visited us twice in a short time. On the one occasion we held a large meeting in Dushanbe city. There he took questions for half of his speech. He is of a very amiable disposition. I know him as a fine comrade...

M.S. Gorbachev: But no kind of oratorical article will save a man if he has nothing to say or has no position, and, contrariwise, if he holds the position that he does not consider or rely on all the other positions.

From the hall: Well the questions were in a large hall, there were 1,200 people there. He answered all questions. In short, we resolved half of the problems at that meeting.

M.S. Gorbachev: So what is your question?

From the hall: I have no question, Mikhail Sergeyevich. I would just like all deputies to support the proposal of the Council of Elders and elect him chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities.

M.S. Gorbachev: Fine, this is, in my opinion, a hint to me as the person in the chair. Nevertheless, I did promise to give the floor to someone. Yes, you, please. And then we shall decide whether or not we shall continue the debate or exchange opinions.

M.M. Safin, chairman of the Lenin kolkhoz, Krasnokamskiy rayon, Bashkir ASSR (Neftekamskiy national-territorial electoral okrug, Bashkir ASSR): We have already been sitting in congress for a long time, and we have listened carefully to everything. To some extent we consider ourselves unequal. Why? Because we have requested the floor many times in order to speak; 4 million people live in Bashkiriya, at the very least; not one of our representatives has spoken at the congress. And now the questions are being asked only by the deputies from the Baltic republics. You are somehow disposed toward those republics, but here sit the representatives of the autonomous republics, which also have populations a million strong. This question, Mikhail Sergeyevich, I think is for you.

And the second is for Rafik Nishanovich. Our republic is represented in the Soviet of Nationalities by only four people. We have a population of 4 million. The union republics have 11 people in the Soviet of Nationalities. We would very much like to know your exact future positive on how the autonomous republics that have such large populations of indigenous nationalities will be represented. What is your position on this and on how we shall regulate this question in the immediate future? We would very much like to know this.

R.N. Nishanov: May I?

M.S. Gorbachev: Yes, of course.

R.N. Nishanov: You have touched on a question that affects the constitutional position. And therefore I cannot answer you outside the limits of the USSR Constitution. Probably once the question is brought up the problem does exist and it must be dealt with in a calm atmosphere and a decision made on how best to resolve it. Of course, I understand that Bashkir and Tatariya are large republics. There are 3.6 million people in the Tatar Autonomous Republic.

M.S. Gorbachev: Here, comrade Ivashko is saying that there are 52 million people in the Ukraine and it also has 11 deputies.

R.N. Nishanov: And 4 million live in Bashkiriya.

M.S. Gorbachev: And in Russia—I am saying nothing.

R.N. Nishanov: There are more than 147 million in the RSFSR, and 20 million in our republic. Of course, this must be studied more calmly. If we approach this simply on a quantitative basis many questions will arise. But evidently a problem does exist and we here in the Soviet of Nationalities must study it in greater depth.

M.S. Gorbachev: Comrades, shall we continue with the questions? I sense that comrade Oleynik still wants to ask a question. And the deputies from Belorussia have a question. After that we shall conclude.

B.I. Oleynik. I once again offer my respects to you, honored Rafik Nishanovich. I would like to clarify something that our colleague, the well-known poetess Gulruskhor Safieyva said. Yes, Uzbeks have written themselves in as Tajiks, and vice versa. They did not write themselves in but were written in—there are two big differences, as they say in Odessa. There have been such cases. I think that your answer shows that we shall never permit such phenomena.

I was very pleased with your concept that each republic will itself resolve language problems, and in particular with reference to giving each language of an indigenous population the status of an official language, taking into account at the state level the interests of all the nations living in a republic and their languages, first and foremost Russian. Because I fully share the viewpoint of Valentin Grigoryevich Rasputin: our shelves may have been empty and we may have lived, and still do live, quite poorly, but we did have a richness that made us proud before the world. This is the pure currency of brotherhood. I think that you and I will do everything to preserve that brotherhood.

Of course, you will also have to be a theoretician. This system and this package of programs has been best worked conceptually among the deputies from the Baltic. Perhaps the arrangement and the orchestration will not always suit everyone, but conceptually it is the most accurate, and I sensed this when I listened to deputy Khallik. Perhaps you will also enlist the theoreticians. That is all I have to say. Thank you.

R.N. Nishanov: I accept your position but there is a small clarification regarding your first remark, respected Boris-aka [an honorific]. The fact is that no one wrote in anyone forcibly, but conditions of life were such that, wishing to provide successful education and then admission to a VUZ and so forth, parents themselves did the writing in. This is also unfair. We have resolved to correct the mistakes of parents, and each person may choose his own nationality.

From the hall: In general I have been studying your calm and restraint and your ability to ease tension, and how you worked in the congress all day long. Our congress is new and I would like to hear if you have any personal proposals about how the Soviet of Nationalities will work in its new channel and what the role of the chairman will be here.

R.N. Nishanov: First of all, if I am elected, I shall see my role as one of insuring full democracy in the life of our chamber. Full agreement in actions and giving the greatest consideration to the proposals and interests of all. Of course, it may be that not all proposals are adopted but if there is a rational kernel that satisfies everyone and our friendly, united community, then we shall adopt it. But if there are proposals that run ahead or in some way are not in the interests of our community, then naturally we shall take counsel with you. I simply promise to insure full-blooded activity in the chamber for any member of our chamber.

M.S. Gorbachev: Well, comrades, shall we end it here?... Wait, if we now decide to continue then we shall continue (I see, comrade Starovoytova, I see). It is simply that there are still questions in all sectors. Shall we continue or limit ourselves? Who is in favor of ending the questions for comrade Nishanov? Please. Please raise your hands.

Against?

Abstentions? An obvious minority. (Applause).

Now, who wants the floor, who has something to say?

Please.

N.A. Samsonov, lathe operator at the Mari "Kontakt" 50-letiye Plant, Yoshkar-Ola city (the Zarechnyy national-territorial electoral okrug): Mikhail Sergeyevich, may I speak? I would like to pose a serious question but have not been given the floor. I am deputy Samsonov from the Mari ASSR.

M.S. Gorbachev: Comrade Samsonov, but it is not I who have not given you the floor. This has already been agreed.

Samsonov: As I understand it, the Supreme Soviet will now be in permanent session. And this is my question: if comrade Nishanov (who as I understand it the first

secretary of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee) is elected chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities how will he be able to handle both posts? Will he not hold both posts simultaneously? Then it is understandable.

M.S. Gorbachev: No, he will switch his work if he is elected. Please.

M.Yu. Dargisov, brigade leader at the Alkhan-Churtskiy sovkhoz, Malgobekskiy rayon (the Nazranovskiy national-territorial electoral okrug): We, the deputies from Chechen-Ingush support the nomination of Nishanov to the post of chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities. But I do have one question, comrade....

During the course of the congress I have received about 140 telegrams. Voters have turned to me as a USSR deputy on the question of restoring Ingush autonomy, abolished by Stalin in 1934. The foundations of the genocide against the Ingush people, as against other peoples, were laid long before the execution of the act of forcible resettlement in 1944. The constitutional right of the people was first violated in 1934, when with complete disregard for the national interests of the Ingush people and their opinion, the Ingush Autonomous Oblast was abolished. The opinion of the Ingush people on the need to eliminate the consequences of the Stalin-Beriya tyranny was expressed in the October (1988) and April (1989) appeals signed by 60,000 people—an absolute majority of the adult population. Those appeals were passed to the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Council of Ministers.

In this connection I ask for a review of the question of setting up an Ingush autonomous Soviet socialist republic by uniting the historically shaped territory of Ingushetiya as it was before Ingush autonomy was abolished in 1934. A decision to create an Ingush ASSR will be an act of full and actual rehabilitation of the Ingush people and a full elimination of all the baneful consequences of Stalinist tyranny and restoration of the Leninist standards of national policy.

I have one more question for deputy Nishanov. When Lenin was alive, the Ingush were entered in the book in the Kremlin. When Lenin died, the name of the Ingush was removed. I ask that the name of the Ingush people be restored there. I remind you that we have museums in which one may learn that when Denikin marched on the North Caucasus the Ingush did not allow him to destroy one Bolshevik. And if you look along Denikin's route, that is where thousands of our people are buried. But I shall not dwell on the hardships we endured. My voters (20,000 people) have told me that if there is any opportunity I should hand this letter personally to Gorbachev. And I so do.

Thank you for your attention.

M.S. Gorbachev: I think that we have heard about a matter that disturbs us. But at present I ask you to talk about the nomination for the post of chairman of the chamber.

Comrade Safiyeva, please.

Just one moment, comrade Safiyeva first and then you shall have the floor.

G. Safiyeva, poetess, chairman of the Tajik republic branch of the Soviet Cultural Foundation, Dushanbe city (from the Soviet Cultural Foundation): Comrades, I have been trying for days to get to this dais, and I am glad and so very happy that finally I find myself here, because there have been so many telegrams and so many telephone calls from women whose wished I wanted to pass on to the congress. And I am very glad that I am able to pass on what they want. Today this is quite appropriate.

I am very glad that Rafik Nishanovich Nishanov will be the chairman of our chamber, a man, it can be said, who is very fine in every respect. Who knows a neighbor better than a neighbor? I would like to address him on behalf of women.

I am from the Cultural Foundation, but what is culture without women? There is a very fine African proverb that says that if you rear a boy child you rear a citizen, if you rear a woman you rear a nation! So that if a nation begins with a woman then let us talk about women!

So what do the women of Central Asia ask? First and foremost an expert examination of their work places in the cotton fields. Comrades, I want to talk about the conditions that have been created for women on Central Asia—I draw no distinction between the Tajik, Turkmen or Uzbek woman. They all live equally poorly and work equally poorly.

In what sense? In the sense of bad conditions. I want our chairman, who is a man who was born in those regions and knows how a woman suffers, to think first and foremost about passing a special law to provide social protection for women in their work and everyday lives. A 4-hour work day must be guaranteed for women. I am talking about women in Central Asia. If anyone wants to talk about other women, then please do. Mothers who have more than three children, and we have families of up to 15 children, should have a wage. For the teacher in the kindergarten gets a wage, but why is it that a woman who has 10 children has no right to a wage? Our women find themselves in a situation of poverty.

There is more. You will probably say, where will the money come from? right? I think that women should be pitied for the way in which they are provided for; their husbands should provide for them. And if the husband has no money, then I suggest that they should get it (here I support Academician Likhachev) by cutting back on unessential organizations that produce little effect,

organs that provide nothing, apart from harm... Including the creative organizations. It is necessary to review all these matters and provide women with the basic conditions for life.

Now, comrades, I want to reproach our scientists: why do the women of Central Asia still have to pick cotton by hand? And then, Mikhail Sergeyevich, why must all the cotton be grown anyway in Central Asia, can it not be grown anywhere else? (commotion and laughter in the hall).

M.S. Gorbachev: At one time when I was a schoolboy in the North Caucasus I picked cotton. But I do not remember when it opened.

From the hall: With us it does not open before December, and each boll weighs just a gram, maybe one-and-half or two grams.

G.I. Safiyeva: And women pick all that cotton. I ask that our chairman—God give him health and success (and we will help him in this)—start his legislative activity with questions of improving life for women.... Our healthy and beautiful nation should care for its women.

M.S. Gorbachev: Very well, now the people from Kazakhstan will speak, and then comrade Medvedev.

From the hall: We are also receiving numerous telegrams and letters. Naturally, before reaching this tribune we traversed a long road of meetings, emotions, and anxieties because the elections were new and people were becoming quite different. But our electors are attacking us: why are you behaving so passively? What about the promises you made to us at the meetings? I would like to reassure my dear voters; you did not elect us just for one congress, or just for 1 year. It is impossible to resolve at just one congress the many organizational and other questions that have accumulated over the decades I therefore think that the deputies who have used the dais mainly to show themselves to the voters yet again will not have pleased them very much. Obviously we shall not solve all our accumulated problems on a dais. We need time, we must consider things, we must approach each problem in a statesmanlike manner. That is how I personally understand it, and this is the position I shall assume.

Another matter: This is the first time I have been elected a deputy to the USSR Supreme Soviet but I have been a deputy of the Kazakh SSR for many years. And previously we did not have the freedom as we now do to ask questions of the proposed chairman of our chamber, to ask him a million political and social and economic questions. Naturally, each of us wants not only to get answers but also to participate in the work of the Soviet of Nationalities that is being created. That is how I understand it, comrades.

The comrades representing the fraternal republics have been speaking here. It seems to me that these words are offensive: "all-union," "autonomous" and other formulations that exist in our country, and they are beginning to annoy many of our deputies.

My friends, it seems to me that that the solution to the problem is not here: who is representing an all-union republic and who an autonomous republic. In this hall we are all equal, we are all equal before our electorates, before our own people, and no matter from where we may have come and no matter whom we may be representing, we represent the great and united Soviet people. I think that this is how we should approach these problems.

In this connection I am pleased that today the following was said in this hall: any of us may speak in his own language, in his own dialect. This is splendid! In this way, through language, through this culture, through this opportunity to discourse in our own language (and perhaps some deputies do not understand this) we are already strengthening the friendship of the peoples of our country. How can this not be a victory for our country—the very fact that today in this hall we can speak in our our native language. We are very pleased, and we remember the woman who said that she would speak in Nanaian. Let us speak. In my opinion it is essential to create the kind of equal conditions in which each of us can speak in his own language. At last, evidently, federation also applies here. A person feels freer when he speaks in his own language. He can say much more. I think that it is precisely this tribune, this hall, that will create that opportunity.

In this connection, Mikhail Sergeyevich, you probably also recall the splendid words of the late Vladimir Chivilikhin. In his novel "Pamyat" he said that there are no large and small peoples, he said that there are numerically large peoples and numerically small peoples. It seems to me that from today we must legitimize and affirm this term so that no kind of superiority for the representative of one people over other peoples may be heard in our country. We are numerically large and numerically small peoples of the one, unified Soviet family.

Accordingly, we, the representatives of the delegate from Kazakhstan, support the proposal submitted by the Council of Elders to elect comrade Nishanov to the post of chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities. We also entertain a definite regard for his education and his shaping and consolidation as a man.

Here we have the Tajiks quarreling, and the Uzbeks quarreling, and we are both Kazakhs, and we can say that at one time we educated him. He comes from Kazakhstan and he grew up and was shaped in Kazakhstan, but we shall not consider this. He is the same for all of us and we shall strive in every possible way to help him and support him to the measure of our strength, but will also

be demanding, and will participate very actively in the work. This is what the deputies from Kazakhstan wished me to convey to the esteemed meeting. Thank you.

N.N. Medvedev, sector chief at the Kaunas Scientific Research Institute of Radio Measuring Equipment, Kaunas city (the Kaunas-Panyemunskiy national-territorial electoral okrug, Lithuanian SSR): Esteemed chairman. Esteemed deputies. You understand that we very often confuse the immediate reason for national dissension with the causes. Comrade Nishanov was asked a question here to which he responded not quite so, in way that did not satisfy us. You understand that when we debated this nomination I was in the Council of Elders. We were in fact pleased with how flexibly and finely Nishanov conducted this meeting and how he responded to the questions, and do not think that I now want to discard his nomination. I want us to think very seriously about it. What has happened in Uzbekistan shows that although this was a drunken fool, it was the immediate cause of the conflict. The reasons obviously lie much deeper. If the soil is unfavorable, no extremist can instigate national conflict. We therefore suggest that the soil does exist there, and in other republics. Without wishing to put aside the nomination of comrade Nishanov, and sensing how well he is able to handle the processes, and having heard the comments from other republics, and having spoken yesterday evening with many of the representatives from other republics, we fell to thinking. We discuss the matter for a long time yesterday evening. It was a very difficult discussion. Now, when we have that kind of situation there, can we divorce him from it? This is a very serious issue, in fact. I would be most reluctant, as I think we all would be, to have another hotbed of tension like Karabakh appear. It would now be desirable to calm it down using all possible means. Do you understand? It is very important. Because I know that when blood is spilt between two peoples then it is very difficult to calm things down. Particularly, probably, with people from the south.

On the other hand I was very pleased that Rafik Nishanovich said that we must build everything on principles of agreement. We shall not bind you to our proposal because sometimes it so happens that it appears that the Baltic people are doing the binding. No, we have only made the suggestion, but you will be able to judge it and accept or reject it. But the question of national relations... Whereas in solving economic questions what is needed is logic and insistence, here what is needed first and foremost is tact and agreement. That is the different between our two chambers.

We therefore propose the following. We, the people's deputies from Lithuania, Estonia and Latvia, consider that the work of the Supreme Soviet should be restructured, starting with the chamber of the Soviet of Nationalities, in which primarily the principle of agreement should be applied at the level of the 15 all-union republics. This principle already applies in the nomination of candidates for the post of chairman of the chamber. The person to whom each all-union republic expresses its trust by a majority vote, with separate debate, can then be represented by members of the chamber for the general election. If such agreement and the trust of all 15 all-union republics cannot be achieved, then new nominations should be made. We consider a simple majority vote for a candidate proposed "from above" to be obsolete in principle and especially unacceptable for the election of the chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities. Let us consider this. This does not mean that we reject the nomination of Rafik Nishanovich.

When we were discussing the matter we were thinking about who could be the chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities. It is probably the kind of person about whom any republic might say "He thinks the way I do." This means that in conversation with Georgians he is a Georgian, with Armenians an Armenian, with Lithuanians a Lithuanian, with Kirghiz a Kirghiz, that is the he understands their soul. We discussed the matter and we thought: there are such people in the USSR. There is, say, Chingiz Aytmatov. Here in Lithuania they love him, as a Lithuanian, as a real Lithuanian. I think that it is similar in other republics. There is Oleynik, and we accept him in the same way. Ion Drutse, Peters, you understand that we do have such people. We must learn to use this potential. And here we have comrade Nishanov; I did not know him well before, now I know him a little better. We do have such people. Let us all consider this carefully. Our chamber should display maximum tact. Thank you for your attention.

From the hall: I have a question for my colleague from Lithuania.

M.S. Gorbachev: Please.

From the hall: Why do you emphasize the all-union republics, the 15 republics? What is this, observing a paragraph or your world outlook?

N.N. Medvedev: I can answer you. You understand that we are accustomed to observing the law. Is my answer to your liking? It is written in the law, in the Constitution—fifteen republics. If the Constitution had been formulated differently then it would be accepted differently and we would respect it just the same.

M.S. Gorbachev: Yes, I think that perhaps we shall not, comrades... Let everyone voice his opinion. But the question I ask myself if... and I am doing a good job of restraining myself... Fewer questions should be addressed to me. And I am receiving so many comments... Because if you recognize the 15 republics in accordance with t Constitution then I fully agree.... But then we have legal standards, on the basis of which we are holding this meeting of the chamber and making our formulations... You respect them but at the same time you are introducing things... Never mind, let us discuss it. Comrade Shevchenko. To be followed by Comrade Tarazevich.

V.S. Shevchenko, chairman of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet Presidium, Kiev City (Kiyevskiy Rural National-Territorial Electoral Okrug, Ukrainian SSR): Esteemed Comrade deputies! The most diverse problems have been voiced a great deal at our congress. But it seems to me that the problem of interethnic relations is not simply being voiced, it is crying out and calling on all of us to help. That is no coincidence. Clearly this is because very many centers of tension based on interethnic relations have emerged in various parts of the country recently. And that causes Soviet people great concern. It causes concern for our common home, our union.

It seems to me that the solution of interethnic problems—of the republics and all the nations and ethnic groups in country—depends to a considerable extent on how they are examined in our chamber. I would say that our chamber has a special role to play. A colleague from a Baltic republic has said that a very respectful attitude is needed here to the opinion of the representative of each nation and ethnic group, a respectful attitude toward culture, language, traditions, and problems. And very much will depend on who is going to conduct our chamber's sittings and who is going to direct the activity of all the deputies of this chamber.

I think that Rafik Nishanovich is probably the most suitable candidate for the post of chairman of the chamber of the Soviet of Nationalities. I know Rafik Nishanovich from our work together in the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. He is a man of very high culture, great tact, and deep knowledge, who has experience of party, soviet, and diplomatic work. I think that in this situation Rafik Nishanovich is perfectly equipped to listen to a large number of opinions and reach a compromise, a compromise in the interests of everyone and of our entire multinational socialist state.

Under the conditions of the further reform of the political system, democratization, glasnost, and the restructuring of the USSR Supreme Soviet's activity, I think that these qualities of Rafik Nishanovich's are of exceptionally great significance, and we fully support his candidacy for the post of chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities. I urge you all to vote for him! I do not think that we shall be making a mistake!

M.S. Gorbachev: Comrade Tarazevich! I see Comrade Vizirov over there; I shall call on him later.

G.S. Tarazevich, chairman of the Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, Minsk City (Molodechnenskiy National-Territorial Electoral Okrug, Belorussian SSR): Comrade deputies! I also know Rafik Nishanovich well from working with him in our country's Supreme Soviet Presidium. I should like to stress that Rafik Nishanovich is a very learned man with a good fundamental grounding in the humanities and education. He is a man with great experience of leading work—party and soviet work—a diplomat who has been very favorably mentioned in the countries where he has been and fulfilled a mission on our country's behalf. Furthermore, Rafik Nishanovich possesses lofty human qualities. I should like to note first of all that he has the ability to unite people around him. He understands people. He knows how to get on with people; he attracts others to him. So it seems to me that these human qualities will play an important role in the great work which awaits our chamber.

Rafik Nishanovich is a man of principle. This is confirmed by the fact that, when he had been secretary of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee but found himself transferred to diplomatic work, he did not abandon his principles. He is a man who really knows how to lead people. We have seen and witnessed for ourselves how he chaired the congress. Therefore our delegation, I mean the Belorussians, will vote unanimously for Rafik Nishanovich and we urge everyone to support his candidacy.

From the floor: We haven't known Rafik Nishanovich as long but I saw him for the first time at the conference conducted by the party Central Committee in Tashkent recently. There were some quite awkward situations there, too. He was able to conduct the conference in a very simple and accessible way and he made a very good impression on all those present. But since the Council of Elders had examined this question, we studied Rafik Nishanovich's biography in depth, and then spoke with comrades from Uzbekistan and Tajikistan. Then we discussed among ourselves, within our Bashkir delegation (yes, his answer on the autonomous republics pleased us very much) and reached the conclusion that he clearly has a very good, sober view of this matter. Therefore, we fully support his candidacy and think that we could not want a better man as chairman of the chamber of nationalities. I think that all the autonomous republics and all the deputies will also support us on this question.

I disagree with the comrade from the Baltic who proposes complicating this question again with more procedures of some kind. What for? There is no need for that!

Here is another suggestion. Even in this situation we should surely observe the standing orders and talk about the candidacy, not about anything and everything.

Thank you for your attention!

G.M. Magomedov, first secretary of the Sergokalinskiy CPSU Rayon Committee [Raykom], Dagestan Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic [ASSR] (Izberbashskiy National-Territorial Electoral Okrug, Dagestan ASSR): Comrades! We small ethnic groups are sometimes unlucky. At the congress we are sitting in the corner at the very back, and here, too, we have also been placed in the corner even though the hall is semicircular. (Animation in the auditorium)

Even though I have heard Comrade Nishanov's name several times before, I did not get to know him personally until the congress, and I am very glad to have been able to make his acquaintance. I saw him several times before the congress, at conferences and meetings of the party group, and I saw him elected a member of the Congress Presidium. I recall how he conducted the congress and chaired a sitting of it. It was gratifying and very pleasing for us to listen to him. His words came to mind: "Everything is in order here, don't worry! Everything is proceeding normally." His tone and style of speaking are good. He chaired the congress skillfully and, when necessary, harshly removed from the rostrum speakers who had come up to speak without his permission.

I also attended the sitting of the Council of Elders. Quite a few questions were put to Comrade Nishanov there. In a speech of about 15 minutes he described how he sees the Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities. Here too, comrades, I realized that I did not want to see any other candidacy for the post of chairman of our Supreme Soviet's Soviet of Nationalities.

Our Dagestan group—there are four of us here and our neighbors in the auditorium at the congress and here—the Buryat group—fully support Comrade Nishanov's candidacy, and I would ask all the colleagues sitting here to cast their votes for him. Furthermore, comrades, I am sure that Nishanov will be elected chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities. And I would ask him to join with us all in paying special attention to the development of our autonomous republics.

Our colleagues from Estonia have put forward an attractive proposal on regional economic accountability here. We have given much thought to this question and reached the conclusion that our autonomous republics still have a long way to go to catch up with the Baltic republics. I should like to quote one example to demonstrate that to you.

Over 100,000 able-bodied people in our republic have no work at the moment. For that reason they have to leave in spring to earn a living in Central Asia, Kazakhstan, Orenburg Oblast, Gorno-Altay Oblast, and other parts of the country. There are probably comrades from Smolensk Oblast here. I have met with them at the congress. Last year we leased from them a state farm [sovkhoz] in Kalininskoye village, Glinkovskiy Rayon. We are to ensure the well-organized resettlement of families from Dagestan to there, take over neglected and deserted villages, and revive the sovkhoz.

We have many proposals for ministries and departments. We ask them to build plants and subsidiaries of plants in our area. I think that the Soviet of Nationalities will help us on this question. We cannot understand it when some deputies speak out and say: We do not want an asphalt plant, a cement plant, or any other plant. We ask, we beseech that plants be built in our area, that our people be given work and can earn a wage so that they do not abandon their families and leave Dagestan to spend 5, 7, or 8 months elsewhere.

Comrades, I consider the question of the Caspian to be of considerable significance also. In the past few years the water level in the Caspian has risen by 135 cm. This is a major calamity. Our coastal towns are simply in a hopeless position. Therefore I think that this question will be resolved in the Soviet of Nationalities. Thank you for your attention. I hope that everyone will support the proposal of my comrades and me and vote unanimously for Comrade Nishanov.

M.S. Gorbachev: Please go ahead....

Voice from floor: (Inaudible).

M.S. Gorbachev: Comrades are drawing attention to the essence of the question. (Noise in hall).

L.A. Arutyunyan, chief of department at the Yerevan State University, Yerevan (from women's councils united by the Committee of Soviet Women): Esteemed chairman, esteemed deputies! I would not have spoken had I not heard the reply to the effect that Rafik Nishanovich intends to organize his activity in such a way as not to offend anyone. In my view, the Soviet of Nationalities is not being set up in order not to offend anyone, but to provide the legislative foundation for our parliament's work.

I am very glad that our future work is going to be calm and emotionally relaxed, but I would very much like not to believe that our work will remain at the level of such mutual relations. And the Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities draft resolution "On Standing Commissions" proves that I am not mistaken. See, the words "law and policy" are not mentioned here. I am absolutely amazed by this fact. Why do we, when citing the names of the commissions, not once use the word "law" and not once use the word "policy"? Is it an accident, or is it a bid regarding the future content of the work of the Soviet of Nationalities? If it is a bid regarding the future content I would like to draw Rafik Nishanovich's attention to the fact that he will be required to show the quality of a reformer in his work. Is he prepared to totally reform the tradition of discussion of nationalities problems?

We are faced today with serious interethnic conflicts; we are faced today with a cumbersome pyramidal machinery, a pyramidal mechanism of ethnic relations which constantly malfunctions. As you will appreciate, plugging the holes will not help, because the river has already burst its banks and it will sweep away the dam. We need to very significantly modify the entire mechanism and to bring it into line with international norms. So there can be no question of good or bad relations. It is a question of innovation, of a new system of relations between

nations. And from this viewpoint the future chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities must be aware of his serious task and be an innovator in this respect.

Finally, I want to say that at the moment we essentially lack a mechanism for representing nations' interests. We still do not even know who is the subject of federation; we do not have a consensus mechanism. Essentially we lack a system for arbitrating on interethnic conflicts. We entirely lack the mechanism.

So a great deal of work has to be done to create a mechanism. Fine words about peace in our common home are an anachronism today. This peace must be safeguarded by law, legislation, and sanctions, not by wishes alone. I wish the chairman of the chamber good, effective work, but I want to assure him that the work can only be effective if he is able to take a critical look at what we have and if he appreciates that the future can only be built on a legal foundation. Thank you.

M.S. Gorbachev: I want to ask you this: Are we going to continue the discussion? There are many who want to, comrades. I notice that despite the diversity of opinion, the deviations from the matter under discussion, and the widening of the issues raised, everyone has supported the proposal that was put forward. Even Comrade Medvedev, when putting forward and justifying approaches to the way we should act when electing the chamber chairman, nonetheless was positive in his reaction to Comrade Nishanov. Perhaps someone has other opinions? Yes. Comrade Starovoytova, please go ahead.

G.V. Starovoytova, senior scientific assistant at the Center for the Study of International Relations under the USSR Academy of Sciences Presidium, Moscow (Yerevanskiy-Sovetskiy National-Territorial Okrug, Armenian SSR): Esteemed comrade deputies! In my view, we are present at the exceedingly important procedure of electing the chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities. In my opinion, this chamber is more important than the Soviet of the Union in our two-chamber parliament. Everyone knows now that ethnic issues are the third component of restructuring, without which the two other components—socioeconomic and political reforms—cannot happen in our country. Therefore I would like to hear a more serious discussion of the problems which the chamber and its esteemed chairman have to tackle.

I would like to say one or two words about how I view these problems, since, unfortunately, this has not been addressed today and I did not hear in esteemed Comrade Nishanov's answers solutions to some very important questions that we will be dealing with for 5 years.

First of all, our Congress of People's Deputies includes representatives of 65 nationalities—so we were told by the Credentials Commission. We know that, according to the latest population census figures, there are representatives of more than 120 nationalities in our country (these are just the amalgamated groups recorded in the census). Thus one-half of the country's peoples are not represented in today's parliament. And some peoples, particularly those who do not have their own forms of national statehood, such as the Crimean Tatars, Germans, Jews, Kurds, and others, are obviously inadequately represented. This is a very important issue. I believe the chamber's deputies will have to confront it and offer prescriptions for solving it.

The second problem is that of renewing our union treaty. As is well known, the Treaty on the Formation of the USSR was concluded on 30 December 1922. An entire historical era has gone by since then. The composition of the sovereign subjects that signed the treaty back then has also changed. The very content of the functions (social, economic, and political) which the republics, as sovereign subjects of the treaty, delegate to the central federal government has also changed. The catalogue, the list of functions clearly needs renewing and overhauling. I believe this is another issue that will face the chamber.

Some problems have already been discussed here—our multitier, four-level national-state structure, and legal guarantees of a nation's right to self-determination. There are definite contradictions here. For example, according to Article 72 of the USSR Constitution, a people representing a union republic have the right to self-determination, even withdrawal from the USSR, but small peoples with other forms of statehood—autonomous oblasts, autonomous republics and okrugs—cannot change their national affiliation even within the context of the union or switch from membership of one union republic to membership of another. That is, peoples' rights are differentiated to a certain extent in the existing structure. I fear that these problems will crop up in the chamber's activities and they will require highly competent expert appraisal.

The entire past year has demonstrated to us that there is a serious lack of readiness to solve these questions and there is a serious fear of setting a precedent. This fear is understandable, because for 65 years we said that the nationalities question has been solved here once and for all. Even today, during the congress, the press has objectively been fueling interethnic tension in certain regions.

Unfortunately, at the moment we do not see a sufficiently competent independent expert appraisal of all these questions; we do not see adequate knowledge of foreign ethnopolitical experience in solving similar problems. I was pleased to hear that Rafik Nishanovich is a candidate of historical sciences, because this chamber must have many specialists, and its chairman above all must be a competent specialist. I would also like to know—I did not have the opportunity to ask this question before—the topic of your dissertation. I have a personal interest, if you like.

Voice from the floor: (Inaudible)

G.V. Starovoytova: Me too, me too.... Are you asking me a question? Yes, if you open the USSR Constitution you will see that I have the right to participate in the chamber's sitting with a consultative vote. Please give me a couple of minutes to finish my speech, because I have been interrupted.

M.S. Gorbachev: Yes, Comrade Staorovoytova. Particularly as the agenda is the election of the chamber chairman, and only then will the chamber decide how to arrange its work and what kind of hierarchy to set up. That is all in the future....

G.V. Starovoytova: What I want to say about this is that I am also happy with—I personally liked the way Comrade Nishanov has chaired a number of sittings, although I cannot speak for my voters. I have received many complaints, but I think that today the simple ability to smooth rough edges, the ability to find a compromise, is a very important ability in general, particularly in the activity of this chamber. A valid scientific program and action platform are needed. Who would be the ideal chamber chairman, I wondered? Possibly, say, a representative of a little people, one that does not have its own statehood, perhaps. Certainly it must be someone in whose republic things are in good shape, where interethnic relations are in good shape. And a number of other conditions, it would seem to me, in abstract terms, must be met.

M.S. Gorbachev: That's it. Let's finish now.

G.V. Starovoytova: I think this problem can be....

M.S. Gorbachev: Comrade Starovoytova, there's no need to introduce an element....

G.V. Starovoytova: ...can be solved by means of rotation, which has already been discussed here by a comrade. I propose rotation.

M.S. Gorbachev: You have exercised your right as an invited guest; you have been given the floor. Do you have a contrary opinion? No. We agreed that if someone had a contrary opinion that person would be given the floor. According to the Constitution, we are gathered here to elect a chamber chairman.

Do you have a contrary opinion? Please go ahead.

E.V. Bichkauskas, investigator for particularly important cases at the Lithuanian SSR Prosecutor's Office, Vilnius (Shilutskiy National-Territorial Electoral Okrug, Lithuanian SSR): Esteemed Mikhail Sergeyevich, esteemed Anatoliy Ivanovich, esteemed deputies. I would like nevertheless to return and put to the vote the proposal from the Baltic republics for each all-union republic to discuss the nomination....

M.S. Gorbachev: They say that there are no Baltic republics.

E.V. Bichkauskas: All right, from Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania. Be kind enough to hear me. I would like to say that the proposal is not at variance with the Constitution since article 111 states that each chamber of the Supreme Soviet shall elect a chairman and two deputy chairmen. And the procedure for electing the chairman is not specified. It undoubtedly should be specified in the Rules for the work of the Supreme Soviet, which we still do not have. And article 115, which talks about the adoption of laws by the chambers, and in fact provides for adoption by a simple majority of votes—but this is the adoption of a law, not the election of the chairman of a chamber. Do not reject this proposal! Just think, this may be a first step toward a democratically necessary mechanism to protect the parliamentary minority! Consider this well!

Please be good enough to vote on the proposal.

M.S. Gorbachev: You are insisting. Very well.

E.V. Bichkauskas: I shall abstain in the vote for comrade Nishanov. If you have the patience then I am ready to offer my ideas. But hear me out, this is another opinion. Up to now all opinions have been more or less the same.

The deputies from the Baltic republics are often reproached for the fact that we are very active, or even too active. This is explained by the fact that we perhaps have a different understanding of the nation. But since we have read the works of Lenin, it does agree with Lenin's understanding of the nation and in no way contradicts the rights of the autonomous republics or the rights of the national republics or the oblasts and krays.

I have seen many violations of democracy during the work of the congress and I thought: this is because with so many people it is simply impossible to work democratically. But here we are gathered as an extremely small number of people, and now it is possible to work democratically. Given this, I see that a different opinion is heard only with great reluctance. But behind each of us there stands an electorate of some particular nationality, and indeed the entire nationality if it is a small one. This is why I ask that no one be insulted when he speaks in this tribune. This is a guarantee of fair national relations, both here in this chamber and throughout the USSR.

For me it was a terrible thing at the congress when during the elections to the USSR Supreme Soviet the Congress of People's Deputies forgot about an entire nation—the Mari ASSR. The congress applauded the action of comrade Chemodanov, but this was an act by one man, and they had forgotten a nation. It was this that terrified me. I was also terrified when deputy Suleymanov from Kazakhstan spoke, and someone said from the hall "Let us stick to the point!" How so, Suleymanov was talking about the rights of small nations, and someone shouts "Let us stick to the point." Is this not exactly the point—the small nations? We were terrified when the concepts of "region" and "republic" were constantly

being confused. And now a new concept has been introduced—some kind of "autonomy." This is certainly not a Leninist concept. Lenin never used such a concept!

If there is no desire in this chamber to hear every, I repeat, every deputy, behind which the interests of the nations stand, then I think I have a right to talk about the possibility of the secession of my native Lithuania from the USSR. This is a constitutional right. And if this continues then I do not want my native Lithuania to be in such a bad union.

From the hall: Were you not terrified after the statement of our colleague?...

E.V. Bichkauskas: What was the name?

From the hall: He spoke today...

E.V. Bichkauskas: Speak, I did not understand, who...

From the hall: The association director...

E.V. Bichkauskas: Ah, the association director! Fine, let us recall that in the "Dvigatel" Association more than 90 percent of the workers are not of Estonian origin. And the director himself conducted the operation in such a way that Estonians did not go there to work. And without asking the agreement of the Estonian people. So that in no way terrifies me. Thank you.

From the hall: It does not seem to you that there might be a Karabakh in Estonia?

E.V. Bichkauskas: I am from Lithuania, not Estonia. Besides, I note that the Russians who live in the national republics have their own native place—Russia. But the people who live on their own land do not have other land. That is all. Thank you for your attention.

M.S. Gorbachev: Dear comrades. May I just sum up the conversation that has taken place here and try to invite you to reach a conclusion?

First. Despite the fact that already at this first session of ours there have been isolated moments that have caused some trouble, I think that the debate is proceeding in the chamber. Even when we have been deciding an organizational question; for what we are talking about is the leader of the chamber, a very important chamber. Let me say candidly that I am pleased by the fact that the debate has been informal. This means that the deputies and members of the Soviet of Nationalities understand the responsibility that rests with this chamber at the present stage of restructuring in the country—the stage of political reform and finding solutions to the numerous problems in interethnic relations.

From this viewpoint I think that we are all united. We can hardly expect that the work of this chamber will be easy, that there will not be discussion, that everything will be rose colored. No. So many complex problems have built up and they have become so acute, and they require so much careful and in-depth study that we say say directly that the chamber faces a great deal of work. And you must all have great respect, great love of labor, and the ability to listen to other opinions. And the many voices of the entire USSR are presented here, and this cannot be avoided. If we want to engage in real politics—and we are saying that our restructuring has been born as an evaluation of the realities both within the country and in the context of the realities that surround the country—then we cannot advance here without basing ourselves on those realities and without taking them into account and without giving due consideration to to all problems that today are causing anxiety among our peoples.

I think that in no case is it possible to move along the path that assumes that this problem is unpleasant and inconvenient and should be brushed aside. This will not do, comrades. This is the lives of peoples, and they must be approached seriously. Otherwise the work will lose all meaning.

I understand that comrades who have spoken—both comrade Arutyunyan and comrade Medvedev, and, in my opinion, comrade Starovoytova—have talked about comrade Nishanov, as it appeared to them, as if he is laying claim to the role of leader of this chamber and should have all the strength and all the potential of the deputies and all the experience that they bring here, as some kind of Lukiuteshitel from Gorkiy's play "At the Bottom."

I do not think that. It seems to me that this is a man who is capable of seeking out all answers and all decisions jointly. If anyone wants to reproach comrade Nishanov for the fact that here he has not given clear answers to some questions, then I think that anyone of us today could not give answers to many questions.

But I caught the feeling, and you also noticed it, of what impressed me about this man: he is a proponent of acting in such a way so as to improve life for all peoples. We shall not move ahead if we do not resolve the problems, if we just spend our time proposing toasts. No, we have reached the stage at which everyone must act. In my opinion, this disposition, this sense of responsibility, and, so to speak, the attempts at this stage to reach agreement and compromise so that a particular problem can be solved, are all something that comrade Nishanov has.

I do not want you to have mistrust or suspicion. I ask you seriously not to suspect cunning intentions of each other. We must look into things, into the last detail of everything. Both in one region, and in t other. Even, if possible, introduce the provision of information for deputies. When any news reaches Moscow and here, the Supreme Soviet, let t deputies agitate so that the leadership of the chamber passes on that information, so that they can get it, as it were, firsthand.

In short, we must create a very good, democracy situation. There is no other way, comrades; the chamber faces much work.

Here, strictly speaking, we still have to discuss the approach. We have a general approach, and it is on this basis that we are reaching decisions at the congress and that we are applying in the Soviet of the Union—an approach that has been shaped among us, so to speak, that in practice flows from constitutional situations. That is one approach. And there is a second approach. A comrade from the Baltic area is proposing that we discuss it. As the deputies from Lithuania, Estonia and Latvia see it, it amounts to having the work of the Soviet of the Union and the chamber of the Soviet of Nationalities adapting their work, first and foremost by applying the principle of agreement at the level of the 15 union republics. That is the proposal. I shall not I shall not read it aloud further. Complaints and dissatisfaction have also been heard here....

From the hall (deputy not introduced): Here we sit, the deputies from Latvia, the authors and co-authors of the statement made by the comrade deputy, I agree not on behalf of the three Baltic republics. And in general I ask that this kind of form—as a statement on behalf of the deputies from a number of republics—be used very carefully.

M.S. Gorbachev: Quite right. Correct. (Applause). The more so since we do have the opportunity to exchange opinions here, and for each person to set forth his position.

From the hall: I beg your pardon that I did not come to you and ask.

M.S. Gorbachev: Nevertheless I would like to ask you this. Shall we pursue the three approaches that have been shaped on the basis of the principles on which we are conducting the congress, or should we adopt the proposal of the comrade people's deputies who have signed it? Here, signatures are real, effective. Shall we now change our approach?

Deputies: No!

From the hall: (Inaudible). (Commotion in the hall).

M.S. Gorbachev: Please stay in your place.

From the hall: (Inaudible). I have....

M.S. Gorbachev: Forgive me, do not place me in an awkward position. Exercising my rights as chairperson I must ask you to return to your seat.

From the hall: I simply did not hear you.

M.S. Gorbachev: Fine, then sit down (commotion in the hall).

Comrades, let is be civil in our dealings. I I am being civil with you. I can sense for myself that this is not easy but there is no other way. So let us start to see influence we can find answers to the most difficult questions.

Shall we change our approach? Does someone have a question for me.

From the hall: Simply from lack of experience I do not know the essence of the proposal expressed earlier by the comrades. What are they proposing? Could you at least give us two words of explanation?

M.S. Gorbachev: The deputies from at least one republic—most of the deputies—think that the nomination is objectionable.

From the hall: Not, you cannot say that!

M.S. Gorbachev: That is exactly it, without going into details.

From the hall: The right of veto, the right of veto...

M.S. Gorbachev: So, by the way, there are other questions that have been raised here that, I think, we can discuss more carefully later, and introduce something into practice. But here the main question is, if one of the republics (most of its deputies) do not support a nomination should that nomination be withdrawn? That is the explanation.

From the hall: Mikhail Sergeyevich, we cannot do this because then the autonomous republics would be placed in a second category.

From the hall: That is correct, correct!

From the hall: There is one other delicate matter for Rafik Nishanovich. Even though we have finished asking questions, nevertheless I think that this question may be in people's minds here in this hall but also in the minds of those watching television. I would like this question to to be clarified. Because I think that it is a delicate question—not simple but very difficult.

M.S. Gorbachev: Ask it, please.

B.V. Miroshin, chairman of the soviet rayispolkom in Orsk city (the Orsk territorial electoral okrug, Orenburg Oblast, RSFSR): I am here with the rights of deputy with deliberative vote. But as I understand it, in accordance with t Rules I have a right to be present. In no way would I want to cast a shadow over Rafik Nishanovich, nor over the representatives of t republic, by the public and our voters know about the events that recently occurred there, associated with the name of Rashidov. I therefore think that in order to prevent any misunderstandings, or even more questions, when we return to our own places it would be a sound thing if Rafik Nishanovich had dealt

with this question today, and explained the situation a little for the voters, and tell what he was doing during those years, and what stance he assumed.

M.S. Gorbachev: Fine, Rafik Nishanovich. this is a big question but nevertheless tell us about its essential nature.

R.N. Nishanov: Of course, some are saying that what occurred in Uzbekistan was a negative phenomenon. I think that it was an abnormal phenomenon: the degeneration of cadres, corruption, sharp practices. It deserves general condemnation and the republic party organization is following this line.

Certain elements of the violations of Leninist principles in cadre selection, placing convenient people in posts, and gradual creating opportunities for violations of socialist legality and the Leninist principles of our morals and life were all appearing in the republic already by the late Sixties. At that time I was a secretary of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee and was dealing with ideological matters. I repeatedly spoke out against these phenomena, both officially and in individual conversations with Rashidov, and I even raised these matters in the CPSU Central Committee. It ended up with me being appointed to the post of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary. And I held that post without relief for 15 years. Then, at the suggestion of the CPSU Central Committee I returned to the republic and became actively involved in the work being done by the republic party organization to effect a moral purge in the cadre corps. In my speech at the congress I said that the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee Buro is waging a principled struggle and will carry it through to the end.

At the same time I would like to respond to the statement made by esteemed deputy Starovoytova. She asked about the subject that I defended in my candidate dissertation. I am a candidate of historical sciences. I defended my thesis in the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences in 1969 and the subject of the dissertation was "The Activity of the Uzbek Communist Party in the International Inuoctrination of the Workers." Thank you.

M.S. Gorbachev: A good subject. So. Can we consider that we have had a thorough discussion?

From the hall: Yes.

M.S. Gorbachev: Yes. Then in that case may I raise the question of the election of Rafik Nishanovich Nishanov to the post of chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities?

From the hall: Yes.

M.S. Gorbachev: I may. You wanted something?

From the hall: Comrades has proposed a right of veto in the election. Naturally I think that it would be undesirable to do this but these are matters that affect the the republics, oblasts...

M.S. Gorbachev: Forgive me comrade, I had not yet finished, they interrupted me. You are right to remind us of this.

From the hall: You understand, we must guarantee the right of the minority because we cannot resolve everything for a particular region by the union.

M.S. Gorbachev: What can we say, comrade, in connection with the the discussion of this situation? Taking into account the sentiment that we are all working here at this time I would think we should operate on the principles we have enunciated today and on which we are relying in reaching our decisions. What I have in mind is the principle of democracy debate and the adoption of decisions by a majority.

At the same time, perhaps, it would be possible to reach a decision through a separate assignment on this proposal: either hand the matter over to a commission or deem it necessary in the future to consider in detail all these matters that relate to the business and organization of work in the Soviet of Nationalities. Is this possible?

From the hall: Yes.

M.S. Gorbachev: And do the comrades who introduced this proposal perhaps agree?

From the hall: There was a proposal to vote for the chairman by republic, but you have introduced a second proposal: to vote in the customary way. So let us vote for which proposal has a majority.

M.S. Gorbachev: Only I think that the first proposal is what is contained in our constitutional provisions. Everything stems from this.

From the hall: It does not state the procedure by which the chairman should be elected.

M.S. Gorbachev: Up to now we have resolved everything on all questions, both at the congress and in all chamber and all the organs, on the basis of the USSR Constitution, that is, within the framework of the principle of democracy, on the basis of adopting decisions by majority. The debates here have also been conducted on this basis. So that the first proposal is the constitutional approach. All the rest or subsequent proposals.

Those in favor of preserving this approach, which stems from our constitutional provisions and on whose basis we are working within the framework of the congress please raise your hands. Thank you. Against? Any abstentions?

So, the matter is resolved. Thirteen against and six abstentions. Now I can place the main question for a vote... Yes, the second proposal. Everyone here has interesting thoughts that can be used in future work. Therefore perhaps we shall do that. We assign the chairman of the chamber together with the deputies (including those who introduced these proposals) to work on this group of questions and then inform the deputies of their ideas so that they can be considered and what is useful taken for organizing the work of the chamber. May we accept this solution, comrades? Those in favor of adopting such a proposal, please raise your hands. Thank you. Against? Abstentions? None. Adopted.

Now I am putting to the vote the question of the election of comrade Rafik Nishanovich Nishanov to the post of chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities. Please raise your hands. Thank you.

Against? Five against. Abstentions? Five against, 11 abstentions. Comrade Nishanov is elected to the post of chairman. Let us welcome him and congratulate him (applause).

Well, I think that (until the chairman takes his seat) we shall declare a recess. Because now we must have discussions in the committees and commissions of the Soviet of Nationalities. A 20-minute recess.

(Recess).

R.N. Nishanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities, is in the chair.

R.N. Nishanov: We are continuing the work of our sitting, comrades. Before we move on to the next question on the agenda, I would like to express to you my tremendous gratitude for your having entrusted this high, responsible post to me. I will try to make the maximum effort to ensure that the tasks facing the Soviet of Nationalities are resolved in a well thought out and successful fashion, and accord with the interests of all nations and ethnic groups.

Comrades! At this sitting it is proposed to examine the question of forming the standing commissions of the Soviet of Nationalities and also to discuss proposals regarding the formation of USSR Supreme Soviet committees. Comrade Deputy A.I. Lukyanov has the floor on this question.

A.I. Lukyanov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet: Comrade deputies! So the Soviet of Nationalities—a component part of the Supreme Soviet—has finally been formed. It is an equal chamber and will, of course, not only resolve questions linked with our nationalities affairs and interethnic relations: any question within the competence of the union will pass through this chamber and be viewed from a nationalities perspective. This means above all economic questions, budgetary questions, and questions linked with the development of our culture and services for the population. It means questions linked with international [mezhdunarodnyy] relations, that is, the broadest spectrum of questions to be tackled by the USSR Supreme Soviet, which is the supreme legislative, administrative, and monitoring organ of state power. These are very broad functions, and you yourselves realize that many of these functions, in particular, both in the sphere of legislation and in the sphere of the budget, simply cannot be resolved by such a broad forum as the congress. They must be resolved by a narrower collegium, a collegium which should resemble to a considerable extent Lenin's Central Executive Committee, which was once elected by the Congress of Soviets. USSR Supreme Soviet committees and commissions play a very large role in this organism of state power. I want to recall that Article 122 of the USSR Constitution indicates that the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities elect from the members of the USSR Supreme Soviet and other USSR people's deputies the chambers' standing commissions to conduct legislative drafting work and the preliminary examination and preparation of questions within the jurisdiction of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and also in order to promote the implementation of USSR laws and other decisions adopted by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies and the USSR Supreme Soviet, and to monitor the activity of state organs and organizations.

Under the Constitution the Supreme Soviet chambers can also create USSR Supreme Soviet committees or a basis of parity and, in addition, a whole series of commissions, including investigative and auditing commissions.

Our Congress Presidium has carried out quite extensive analytical work in implementing these constitutional directives. As you know, all deputies were given a questionnaire and a draft resolution listing the commissions and committees that could be formed at the USSR Supreme Soviet. We asked every deputy to express his opinion as to which commission he would like to work in. Approximately 1,800 deputies responded to this questionnaire. Four-fifths of them supported the proposals regarding the named commissions and advocated participating in a commission. Some comrades indicated that they could take part in two commissions. Others named two commissions and said that they agreed to be involved in either of them. Approximately 12 percent of the responses contained proposals for refining the list and the work assignment of the Supreme Soviet commissions and committees. So we took these proposals from deputies most actively into consideration when putting the finishing touches to the proposals.

On what premise did the Supreme Soviet Presidium, the chambers' Councils of Elders, who received a report on this, and the Congress Presidium proceed?

First. We proceeded on the premise that the membership of the chambers is not very large, comparatively speaking: Each chamber has 271 deputies. If we increase the number of commissions ad infinitum we will simply be unable to ensure the requisite balance, which envisages that each commission complies with the following proportion: One congress deputy to every member of the chamber.

Second. We proceeded on the premise that the commissions cannot be rigidly tied to sectors of state management. Otherwise they will duplicate ministries and departments even in their titles, which will, of course, impede their parliamentary activity and the fulfillment of their parliamentary functions, and distort the parliamentary assignment of commissions and committees.

Third. Subcommissions or subcommittees will undoubtedly be set up within the commissions and committees. It is here that questions of interest to the Supreme Soviet and your chamber must be analyzed in depth. That is, every committee will have within it a subdivision dealing with particular issues.

Last, at the sitting of the chambers' Councils of Elders last Saturday we arrived at the unanimous opinion that, when setting up committees [as published] in one chamber, it is necessary to take into account the fact that commissions with a different assignment will operate in the other chamber, but committees will be formed jointly. That is, we must have a comprehensive approach to this problem. So when we talk about Soviet of Nationalities commissions, we must see without fail what commissions the Soviet of the Union has set up. Therefore at the sitting of the chambers' Councils of Elders we carefully went through the whole package of proposals, so to speak, as to what commissions and committees the Supreme Soviet should have.

Then, as you know, the first sitting of the Soviet of the Union was held and discussed these questions in detail in an atmosphere of quite keen debate, after which a resolution was adopted regarding the formation of Soviet of the Union standing commissions; this has been published. You have seen it.

So permit me to briefly inform you how work on these documents went and what amendments have already been submitted and are being submitted for your examination. Okay, first a word about the Soviet of the Union standing commissions. It is proposed to form an equal number of standing commissions—four each—in each chamber. At the same time, the 19th party conference stressed that we should abandon the functional depersonalization of the chambers. The Soviet of the Union, which reflects nationwide interests, should concentrate above all on questions of statewide significance, and the Soviet of Nationalities should have its own profile, linked with the development of nations and ethnic groups and the development of union and autonomous republics and other autonomous formations. Proceeding on this premise, the Soviet of the Union formed the following commissions. A Planning, Budget, and Financial Commission. As you can see, this deals with the USSR's entire plan and entire budget. The Commission for Questions of the Development of Industry, Energy, Equipment, and Technology also constitutes a statewide question. A Commission for Transport, Communications, and Information Science Questions. Once again an all-union question. Lastly, a Commission for Labor, Prices, and Social Policy Questions. Here the perspective that was chosen is that labor relations and labor should be regulated on a countrywide scale, identically with regard to every citizen; this constitutes equality of rights for citizens. Prices are of most fundamental significance in general for the whole market and for all commodity turnover. Lastly, the main directions of a strong social policy are, indisputably, a statewide question.

You have obviously noticed that, compared with the original versions distributed to deputies, the names of some commissions have undergone changes, and quite substantial changes, too. This is no mere gesture to form, but an endeavor to more precisely define the all-union essence of the sphere of work, that is, to encapsulate a mighty set of problems whose resolution transcends the bounds of republican competence and the regional level and which must be resolved by the union as a whole.

As for the Soviet of Nationalities standing commissions, the conclusions of the 19th party conference that this chamber should primarily resolve questions with a direct bearing on the subjects of our federation—the republics and autonomous formations—and the development of Soviet nations and ethnic groups were also used as the basis here. That is why the Councils of Elders propose moving the Commission for Interethnic Relations to the foreground here in this chamber. There is certainly no need to comment in detail on this proposal. Very many questions have accumulated in this sphere, and our current sitting attests to this. A very great deal of, let us be blunt, very complex work lies ahead of us here. The next commission is the Commission for Questions of the Social and Economic Development of Union and Autonomous Republics and Autonomous Oblasts and Okrugs. This constitutes, as it were, the republican, nationalities aspect of the Planning, Budget, and Financial Commission, but with its own perspective. These commissions can work together. But the Soviet of Nationalities commission has its own perspective, which should be reflected as much as possible when elaborating the plan, the budget, and other economic programs—namely the perspective of consideration of ethnic relations. This is a most serious commission. It would certainly be right to say that this commission does indeed by and large resemble the Soviet of the Union Planning, Budget, and Financial Commission, but only with regard to the republics. Obviously, this Soviet of Nationalities commission will have a number of subcommissions; in particular, the Council of Elders discussed the fact that it would be advisable to have a special subcommission

within this commission dealing with questions of the development of our country's small peoples. All economic and management questions meet here and must be resolved here.

Next. It is proposed to establish a commission linked with the work of those sectors of the economy which are now—according to the new concept published not so long ago—being completely transferred to republican jurisdiction. This is the Commission for Consumer Goods, Trade, and Municipal, Consumer, and Other Services to the Population. As you know, there is a mass of problems here. They must be very thoroughly resolved, including from the viewpoint of solving ethnic problems.

The next commission is the Commission for Questions of the Development of Culture, Language, National and International Traditions, and Protection of Historical Monuments. The opinion expressed by both chambers' Councils of Elders and deputies' proposals on this question were based on the fact that the roots of our multinational culture are found here, in the development of every nation and ethnic group. It is from the cultures of all our country's peoples that our multinational Soviet culture takes shape. That is why it is proposed to have this commission among the commissions within the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities. Thus it is proposed to create four commissions within the Soviet of Nationalities, just as within the Soviet of the Union.

Now a word about the committees. Is is well known that they will be created by both chambers on a basis of parity. Certain amendments to the original outlines handed out to deputies were made during the discussion of this question in the chambers' Councils of Elders and also at the sitting of the Soviet of the Union.

I will comment on them in brief. Thus, it is proposed to form an International Affairs Committee, which will encompass both foreign policy and foreign economic questions and will engage in interparliamentary ties and, to some extent, questions of humanitarian cooperation and so on. In my opinion, everything is clear here.

Next, a Committee for Defense and State Security Questions. The Soviet of the Union discussed these questions for a long time and decided that they are so closely interconnected that they should be linked together. The Soviet of the Union sitting also raised the question of whether this committee will monitor the activity of state security organs. It certainly will. The KGB falls within the purview of this parliamentary committee. But, as Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev pointed out, it will, of course, have a special status, as in all foreign parliaments.

The next committee is the Committee for Questions of Legislation, Legality, and Law and Order. It has been said here that there is no mention of the legal principle when forming the committees. But this is the main committee which will deal with legal questions. Of course, this committee will be most involved with legal drafting work and fine-tuning the wording of legislation and statutes. But it is very important to ensure that it is linked—and this was stressed, you will remember, at the congress itself—with the state of affairs in the sphere of legality and with law and order. It must be able to supervise the practical implementation of laws, study this work, and monitor the activity of law enforcement organs. Without this, there would be no point to pure legislative work, especially as other committees—all the other committees—will also engage in legislative work, with this committee's participation, of course. Practice shows that the Legislative Proposals Commission cooperated very closely with other USSR Supreme Soviet commissions.

Next. Also on the basis of many deputies' views, it is proposed to create a Committee for Questions of the Work of Soviets of People's Deputies and of the Development of Management and Self-Management. I must say that this is a new committee and is absolutely necessary because the Supreme Soviet is indeed the apex of the entire pyramid of our country's soviets and must resolve a host of questions—most complex ones, I can tell you. That is why we received so many proposals regarding the creation of this committee from the localities and literally from soviets at all levels—rural, settlement, rayon, municipal, oblast, and kray soviets. All the soviets were in favor of creating this committee.

The next committee whose proposed creation has been submitted for your examination is also linked with deputies' wishes and the conclusions of Mikhail Sergeyevich's report at the congress. I am talking about the Committee for Economic Reform Questions. There was no mention of this committee in the material you were given at first. The Soviet of the Union Planning, Budget, and Financial Commission, the Soviet of Nationalities Commission for Questions of the Social and Economic Development of Union and Autonomous Republics and Autonomous Oblasts and Okrugs, and the Committee on Economic Reform Questions, will in fact work in the closest contact. Such is the specific nature of these parliamentary institutions, and it is important, of course, that their chairmen coordinate their work in this very important area.

The next committee which the chambers' Councils of Elders deemed it advisable to establish is the Committee for Agrarian Questions and Food. It was first entitled "for Agrarian Policy and Food," but then it was decided that policy is a somewhat general sphere, as it were, and we will have specific—agrarian and food—questions of a parliamentary type. As you know, it was first proposed to set up this committee in one of the chambers, but then we reached the conclusion that this must be a general parliamentary committee—a committee set up by both chambers on a basis of parity. As you know, this coincides with the opinion of the more than 400 deputies

specializing in the agrarian sphere who signed the appeal to the congress, although I must say that they conceive of the committee somewhat differently—cluttered with a corresponding apparatus.

M.S. Gorbachev: Anatoliy Ivanovich, comrades have approached me here and some of them are worried; they think that everything has been eliminated at government level. But here, on the contrary, as you will hear, a proposal is going to be submitted, and there will be a first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers who will head this whole complex. And all this will also be studied at government level. So that this is at the level of the Supreme Soviet, and at the government level—everything will be considered there, too.

A.I. Lukyanov: And there will be this committee. Its main function is not just to draw up laws in this sphere but also to monitor, above all, the departments concerned with these questions. This is the specific feature of a parliament, of parliamentary monitoring.

Now the Committee for Construction and Architecture Questions. There were many proposals for it. Some people said that its title should refer only to urban planning, but in that case we would have been forgetting agricultural construction. Others said that a Committee for Architecture and Construction is necessary, and they are still not withdrawing their proposal. But everyone agreed that it would be most apt if we call this committee the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Construction and Architecture.

The question of the Committee for Science and Public Education was thoroughly discussed. We could have taken the course of splitting it into two parts—science and public education. But it was deemed expedient—and deputies at the sitting of the Soviet of the Union and the chambers' Council of Elders advocated this—to combine these elements in one parliamentary organ, since it is simply impossible to separate science, particularly VUZ [higher educational institution] science, from education.

Moreover, during discussion of this question at the sitting of the chambers' Council of Elders, it was also considered necessary to include questions of upbringing here, because education had been divorced from upbringing, as it were. This addition is highly significant. Thus the title now reads the Committee for Science, Public Education, and Upbringing. Although clearly a minimum of three autonomous subcommittees may be necessary here.

Now for the Committee for the Protection of the People's Health. Proposals were submitted on this question by the Academy of Medical Sciences. Given the present state of health protection, it is clear that this committee will have a very, very great deal of work.

The next committee is the Committee for Women's Affairs and Family, Mother, and Child Protection. Initially the idea was to have two committees—a committee for women's affairs and a committee for the affairs of the family and children. But eventually all deputies came to the common conclusion of having a single such committee.

At the sitting of the Soviet of the Union (as compared with the version of the chambers' Council of Elders and deputies' proposals) a new, very important and substantial element appeared in the definition of this committee—the family, protection of the family. This derives from life; the deputies proposed this themselves. We are very concerned now by the not altogether satisfactory, to put it mildly, situation regarding the family, divorces, single mothers, orphans, and so forth. And it is directly enshrined in our Constitution that the Soviet state concerns itself with and takes care to strengthen the Soviet family.

Next the Committee for the Affairs of Veterans and Invalids. Then one more committee—the Youth Affairs Committee. Here no one had any doubts that these committees are necessary and that they are confronted with quite a few complex questions. Matters regarding the setting up of a Committee for Questions of Ecology and the Rational Use of Natural Resources are exactly the same. Dozens of speeches at the Congress of People's Deputies and numerous publications in the mass media have revealed the full acuteness of this problem, although I should tell you that, unfortunately, when deputies were asked, not very many of them signed up or offered their services as participants in the work of this difficult committee. Finally, the Committee for Citizen's Rights and Appeals. I should tell you that the question of whether there should be a separate committee for rights was examined. Deputies, however, came to the conclusion that a committee which will be closely linked with the proposals and complaints received by the USSR Supreme Soviet must be set up. And, comrades, there are around half a million statements, proposals, and complaints to the Supreme Soviet each year.

The possibility of directly reacting to breaches of citizens' rights should be created. And here the Supreme Soviet is called upon to firmly adopt a stance of strictly protecting Soviet people's legitimate rights and interests. A substantial addition was made to the committee's title during the examination of this question at the Soviet of the Union sitting, and the committee is now entitled the Committee for Questions of Glasnost and Citizens' Rights and Appeals. Just a single word—glasnost—was added, and the committee's functions immediately took on a more profound meaning. These, comrades, are the committees, 14 of them, which it is proposed be formed jointly by the two chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Thus, while the question of the Soviet of Nationalities standing commissions can be resolved today, right now, the question of committees, if the chamber

approves the submitted list with or without amendments, will be referred to the joint sitting of the USSR Supreme Soviet chambers and finally decided there. I would like to add to what has been said that we will of course need to set up various, so to speak, ad hoc committees, commissions, and so forth.

The congress has already set up three commissions on specific current questions, and in this regard certain deputies, in particular Deputy Revenko at the Soviet of the Union sitting, said, correctly in my view, that there is no need to be in a hurry now to rigidly define the number of committees and commissions to be formed. We need to reserve the right to flexibly alter the assignment of commissions and committees if need be. Especially as it will often be quite difficult in practice to drawing any kind of insuperable dividing line between commissions in the different chambers or with different assignments. However, constantly increasing the number of commissions makes no sense either. They will operate, as a rule, in close contact and it is therefore impossible to draw sharp boundaries between them.

As you know, it is proposed that each commission will consist of 40-45 deputies, roughly half being members of the Supreme Soviet and half USSR people's deputies. They will cooperate closely, will bolster the whole work of the Supreme Soviet and the chambers during recesses, will be very much concerned with monitoring and legislative functions, and will undoubtedly make their own contribution to the whole work of our supreme representative organ. These are the proposals which I have been instructed to report to you on behalf of the the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and our chambers' Council of Elders, and I ask you to carefully examine this very important question which will determine the area of activity and the actual course of the work of the Soviet of Nationalities in the upcoming period.

R.N. Nishanov: Will there be questions, comrades, for Anatoliy Ivanovich?

From the floor: (Inaudible)

A.I. Lukyanov: No, questions now.

R.N. Nishanov: No, questions for the moment, then we will proceed to discussion.

From the floor: I would like to know where the Constitutional Oversight Committee comes in.

A.I. Lukyanov: The Constitutional Oversight Committee is elected by the Congress of People's Deputies separately. The members of this committee are not Supreme Soviet deputies and it has different functions, which may, among other things, be connected with evaluating laws and acts which the chambers adopt.

R.N. Nishanov: Please come up to the rostrum, to the microphone.

From the floor: I would like to know the following: What is the future procedure for determining who serves on the commissions and committtees? How is this planned?

A.I. Lukyanov: We plan that the composition of committees should be the concern of the chamber itself, above all the chairman of the chamber, who will carry out consultations with deputies and take account of the proposals which were in the questionnaires, and the committees will be formed in this way.

The committee chairman will certainly be someone released from all other functions. He will be concerned only with the work of the committee. Clearly the deputy chairman, who does not have to be a member of the chamber, and the committee or commission secretary will also certainly be released for the whole period, unless they are replaced on rotation. This constitutes great, serious, and permanent work in the Supreme Soviet. That is how the creation of committees is conceived. Of course, the questions and wishes of the actual deputies and consultations with the chairmen will play a predominant role here. After all, you will appreciate that there cannot be, for example, a Committee for the Protection of the People's Health made up solely of doctors. Soviet workers and the directors of enterprises which have their own polyclinics, hospitals, and so forth are also necessary there. There must be a broad spectrum there. A committee should not be narrowly professional.

Therefore it is necessary to show restraint here, to work within the bounds of reason, so to speak, and show moderation. All the deputies' potential must be invested in the committee's work.

R.N. Nishanov: So, Comrade Safiyeva.

G. Safiyeva, poet, chairman of the Tajik Republican Department of the Soviet Culture Foundation, Dushanbe City (from the Soviet Culture Foundation): Did I imagine it, or have they dropped such an important committee as the Committee on Literature, Culture, and Art? What happens to us?

A.I. Lukyanov: Yes, this question was discussed very thoroughly in the Soviet of the Union, and it was deemed appropriate for cultural matters to come under the commission of the Soviet of Nationalities, because that is where culture has its roots. That does not mean that the Planning, Budget, and Financial Commission will not be concerned with culture. It will also deal with appropriations for culture and so forth. It does not mean that the other commissions, on, say, education, will not be concerned with culture. But all the same, it was decided to place the emphasis here and form a commission in your chamber.

R.N. Nishanov: Right, your question, please.

From the floor: Anatoliy Ivanovich, is it possible for one deputy to participate in the work of both a committee and a commission? Or is that ruled out?

A.I. Lukyanov: We did not envisage that. We wanted each deputy to concentrate his efforts in one specific place. But if he is interested in the work of some committee or commission to which he does not belong, it is now enshrined in the standing orders, and we want to make provision for it in the Law on Status, that a deputy has the right to a consultative vote at the sittings of these committees and commissions. But he himself belongs to one particular committee. In all, comrades, there will be 800-850 deputies taking part in the work of committees and commissions, which means that we are immediately taking nearly half of the Supreme Soviet for permanent work in these important organs of our....

M.S. Gorbachev: No. Not of the Supreme Soviet. Of the commissions.

From the floor: (Inaudible)

From the floor: Anatoliy Ivanovich, I would like to add to, or rather, enlarge on the propositions put forward by Comrade Safiyeva. Is it the case that questions of culture, language, and other nationality problems, so to speak, are the concern of the Soviet of Nationalities?

M.S. Gorbachev: Yes.

From the floor: The Soviet of the Union is virtually abandoning cultural matters. Especially since the committee of both chambers, where it says "Committee on Science, Public Education, and Upbringing," omits the most important thing. All this—science in a civilized world, public education, upbringing—it is all based on culture. So how can the word "culture" be omitted? The Soviet of the Union automatically avoids discussing cultural problems and issues. Thus language, culture, and other—so to speak—problems become solely the prerogative of the Soviet of Nationalities. I would like to propose that all this be given proper consideration. In my opinion science, public education, and upbringing cannot be divorced from culture, and cultural matters should form part of the functions of that committee.

A.I. Lukyanov: If I am allowed also to express my own position as a deputy, I would in that case propose another solution. We have a Commission (in the Soviet of the Union) for Labor, Prices, and Social Policy. So perhaps we should advise the Soviet of the Union to add an element to the title, and say: "sociocultural policy." Then we will take everything into account. If you want to tie culture solely to science, public education, and upbringing, then it seems to me that the approach will be too narrow.... I would like to say, comrades, that practice shows that as soon as a contentious issue falls within the sphere of activity of two commissions, the situation that arises is that "everyone's business is no one's business."

R.N. Nishanov: Does anyone wish to speak on this question, on this specific question? You want to speak on this question? Go ahead, please.

A.I. Lukyanov: Let's hear the questions, so that we can answer everyone.

From the floor: On the question of culture.

B.S. Safarov, shift engineer at the aviation technology base at Kulyab Airport, Kulyab City (Kulyabskiy National-Territorial Electoral Okrug, Tajik SSR): The point is that formerly this question of culture came under the jurisdiction of the Soviet of the Union. But that did not help. For nearly 45 years now we have been excavating an archaeological monument which is of enormous value to all mankind, because it has a thousand years of history. But to this day no one is willing to help us. So we think that cultural matters should come under the Supreme Soviet and its Soviet of Nationalities, so that the opinions of all nations and the interests of all peoples are taken into account.

R.N. Nishanov: Right, questions please.

From the floor: (Inaudible)

A.I. Lukyanov: I propose—in the Soviet of Nationalities.

R.N. Nishanov: One moment, I am giving the floor to the lady. And then you. Go ahead.

From the floor: If you want to finish, I will give way to you.

R.N. Nishanov: Fine.

From the floor: Let us resolve the question of setting up a Culture Committee. We have unionwide problems. In particular, the creation in Moscow of an all-union aesthetics center, the creation of an all-union museum of children's art, the creation of a museum of modern art. All these problems cannot be tackled only in the subcommissions and commissions that exist within the Soviet of Nationalities. I believe a Culture Committee is abolutely essential. Experience shows that for many years the USSR Ministry of Culture has failed to cope with one of our country's deficiencies, the culture deficiency. That is why I propose that an emphasis be placed on culture.

R.N. Nishanov: Right, any more questions? Go ahead.

From the floor: I would like to ask a question that was already raised at the session of the Council of Elders. In particular, about the Commission for Socioeconomic Problems of Development. The question was raised of how the interests of autonomous oblasts are to be taken into account, if we do not refer at all here to the formation of which they form a part administratively, that is, the kray. If they are to resolve matters in isolation from all the problems of the kray, I do not think they are

likely to resolve them at all. Yet krays as national formations incorporating an autonomous oblast already exist. What is your opinion on this?

A.I. Lukyanov: My opinion is that sometimes an autonomous oblast really needs defending from the kray. The chamber will do this. That is the first thing. Second. It is my opinion that there has long been an urgent need for the autonomous oblast's budget and plan to appear as a separate item approved by the republic (specifically for an autonomous oblast), because unfortunately very many violations have emerged in this connection in the course of preparations for the CPSU Central Committee plenum on interethnic relations.

R.N. Nishanov: Your question, please.

From the floor: The economist deputies from Lithuania have proposed that instead of the Commission for Consumer Goods and so forth, a Commission for the State Structure of the USSR be formed. There are questions that must be resolved: representation, the voting procedure, the state structure of a multinational country.....

A.I. Lukyanov: I can comment on this question as follows. If we are to set up a Commission for State Structure, that is, on virtually the entire wide spectrum of questions of relations within the USSR, these functions could be exercised by only one commission, which we are already proposing (as we have heard in deputies' speeches) to set up at the congress. This is the Constitutional Commission, which will be set up at the congress and will draft a new USSR Constitution. All the other questions relate in one way or another either to interethnic relations, or to economic relations, and so forth. Here the main question is for the competence of the union to be defined absolutely precisely and exhaustively, and for all other questions that are outside the competence of the union to be resolved within the union republic. That is the principle. This can only be resolved in the constitution, and nowhere else.

From the floor: We have a Commission for Trade, and so forth. Why do we need it?

A.I. Lukyanov: Comrades, practice shows that we do. I do not know whether the Baltic republics need such a commission in the Supreme Soviet, but questions relating to trade and services to the population will certainly arise in your chamber, there is no avoiding them. And incidentally, this will not be a matter of the union interfering in your affairs, in the republic's affairs. The point is that the union could help the republic.

R.N. Nishanov: Comrade Gamkrelidze, please.

T.V. Gamkrelidze, director of the Georgian SSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Oriental Studies, Tbilisi City (Akhalshenskiy National-Territorial Electoral Okrug, Adzhar ASSR): It appears that the last two commissions of the Soviet of Nationalities—the Commission for Questions of the Development of Culture, Language, National and International Traditions, and the Protection of Historical Monuments, and the International Relations Commission....

R.N. Nishanov: Interethnic relations.

T.V. Gamkrelidze: ...the Commission for Interethnic Relations overlap to some extent. You cannot examine interethnic relations or study them without examining questions of culture, language, and national traditions. It seems to me that it would be more expedient to form a Commission for Questions of Culture, Language, National Traditions, and Interethnic Relations—for one. And the second should be the Commission for the Protection of Historical Monuments, because a Commission for Interethnic Relations cannot exist without examining questions of culture, national traditions, and language.

A.I. Lukyanov: The practice we have today has shown, comrades, that it is simply impossible to reduce interethnic relations to questions of culture, language, or national and international traditions. Interethnic relations are much broader and deeper: They include economic relations, political relations, and so forth. If we want to study questions of culture and language specially, then of course such a commission is expedient. A Commission for the Protection of Historical Monuments will cover, in my view, too narrow a range of questions. But that is for the deputies to decide.

R.N. Nishanov: Fine. Your question?

From the floor: (Inaudible).

A.I. Lukyanov: Certainly, but not only that.

R.K. Odzhiyev, deputy chairman of the "Internatsionalist" Cooperative Association, Tajik SSR, Dushanbe City (from the Leninist Communist Youth League [Komsomol]): Please explain to me: What is the basis of the relations between our chamber and the commission that has now been set up on the events in Tbilisi?

A.I. Lukyanov: I think that is an ad hoc commission, not a standing commission. It was set up by the congress, not the chamber. And I think that commission has its own, limited range of questions that it has to answer. Interethnic relations and so forth is a permanent range of questions that must be worked on. Someone has mentioned this range of questions, the number of "hot spots" alone that we have, is approximately 18-20. These will have to be studied constantly. But the commissions on Georgia and other matters are temporary; that is how they were conceived.

R.N. Nishanov: Comrade Ambartsumyan, please.

V.A. Ambartsumyan, president of the Armenian SSR Academy of Sciences, Yerevan City (Ashtarakskiy National-Territorial Electoral Okrug, Armenian SSR): I agree that each deputy can belong to no more than one commission. But it would be good—because deputies have wider interests—if he had the right, say, to receive materials from another commission, too, in order to study them. For him to be able to declare this interest, and the materials would be sent to him regularly.

A.I. Lukyanov: Viktor Amazaspovich, this right will be guaranteed. A deputy wishing to participate in the work of a given commission should receive materials from that commission.

R.N. Nishanov: Right, your question. And then yours.

M.L. Bronshteyn, faculty chief at Tartu State University, Tartu City (Tartuskiy-Sovetskiy National-Territorial Electoral Okrug, Estonian SSR): I and a number of deputies see no point in setting up a Commission for Consumer Goods, Trade, and so forth. It duplicates the Commission for Socioeconomic Questions, especially since according to Maslyukov's draft these questions are transferred to the competence of the republics. But it is extremely important to have a Commission for Interethnic and Interregional Economic Relations, or a Common Market. We could be united by a common market, if we carry on trade between republics. This is a factor that could act in the direction of unity. This question is not covered anywhere at present: neither in the Soviet of the Union nor in the Soviet of Nationalities. It seems to me that it is extremely important to have such a commission.

A.I. Lukyanov: If you want to know what I think, let me tell you that in effect two commissions will be concerned with these questions. First, the Commission for the Development of Republics which we have named—the second commission of the Soviet of Nationalities. And interethnic economic relations will undoubtedly to some extent come under the Commission for Interethnic Questions. Otherwise—without a market, without direct ties, without all the rest of it—this commission too, is, inconceivable.

M.L. Bronshteyn: But that will be a very concrete area of work; it will differ from all the others.

A.I. Lukyanov: Yes, we must at all costs set up a subcommission there on these very sensitive, subtle, but very necessary questions of economic reform.

M.L. Bronshteyn: Nonetheless we ask to raise and consider this question.

A.I. Lukyanov: As regards trade, services for the population, and so forth, I must say that there was no objection from deputies demanding its exclusion, and we are proposing that it be set up precisely in the Soviet of Nationalities, since these questions have been placed entirely within the jurisdiction of union republics.

R.N. Nishanov: Your question.

From the floor: My proposals are about creating a Commission for Land Use. For some reason the Council of Elders ignored these proposals. However, I believe, and many deputies believe, that a Commission for Land Use is very necessary. We have all kinds of committees here and all kinds of commissions, but we are not reflecting land use anywhere. (Noise in the auditorium) No, pardon me, but this question does not concern agriculture alone, it concerns industry, protection of the environment, and nationalities questions as well.

A.I. Lukyanov: I agree with you, and questions of land use in the agro-industrial complex will be dealt with.... These questions will be dealt with by the agro-industrial complex, but that is not an end to the issue. The point is that, in my view, to the maximum extent possible (if we want to protect the interests of the lessee, if we want to protect the interests of land users in general) all questions of land use must be placed within the charge of the commissions dealing with the soviets of people's deputies. They must have maximum competence in the sphere of land use, and maybe at some stage there will be such a subcommission or subcommittee.

R.N. Nishanov: Right, your question please.

N.V. Neyland, Latvian SSR deputy foreign minister, Riga City (Darztsiyemskiy National-Territorial Electoral Okrug, Latvian SSR): I would like to ask you, Anatoliy Ivanovich, about the second committee, although you have already said that defense and state security questions have much in common. Naturally, they have secrecy in common. But there are secrets and secrets. I think that if we look at the military-political problems that are being discussed in Geneva, Vienna, and so forth, these actually contain more of foreign policy than of state security. What are we losing? First, there is international practice. In both Britain and America—everywhere has different committees and commissions for defense and for state security. State security is often examined by hearings behind closed doors. If we close the doors on defense questions in the same way as on state security, we will also lose out with regard to the trust that we are now gaining. Glasnost is developing on questions of military building, but it's having a hard time. Two years ago we promised we would say what our military budget is. Mikhail Sergeyevich has just announced it. Last year we spoke of the structure of our Navy from the UN platform. But I am sure that in our country no one knows this, although the whole world knows it. What we had in our country was a tiny little report on Petrovskiy's speech from the UN platform.

That's not all. Today we do not know how many weapons we sell and how many we give away. At any rate, the Defense Committee has plenty of work. And I am very much afraid that the glasnost that is gradually spreading to questions of military building in our country will take refuge behind state security (where hearings must naturally be in camera).

A.I. Lukyanov: I can go along with you in saying that a gradual expansion of glasnost is needed here, and I do not think that the KGB can block defense problems. On the contrary, we certainly did not proceed from questions of secrecy in defining this committee. The point is that the sphere of the protection of our border is most closely involved with defense. This is approximately half of what the KGB does. That is the point one.

Two. A considerable proportion of international security questions—arms reduction and so forth—will be dealt with not only by the Defense Committee but also by the Committee for International Questions. That is, once again there will be an interface, once again there will be joint studies and hearings. And on such international questions they will mostly be open hearings. Open.

M.S. Gorbachev: And subcommittees can probably also be created later, in order to learn.

A.I. Lukyanov: So inside the committee there should probably be some kind of narrow subcommittee that will deal with totally secret questions, and as for the rest, neither the Supreme Soviet nor, I think, the Supreme Soviet Presidium is interested in engaging in excessive secrecy here.

R.N. Nishanov: Right, your question please. You're next.

From the floor: My question has to do with the fact that I can see in neither the commissions nor the committees how questions of religion and religious buildings will be resolved. This is a very sensitive question; there are already hunger strikes, people are asking that churches be opened, and so forth. I don't see these issues here.

A.I. Lukyanov: Without mentioning religion, in view of the separation of church from state, we specifically assigned these questions to the commission that is to deal with traditions. That's where religion comes in.

From the floor: I've got another question. It says here: "protection of historical monuments." We have long had such a law in our country—it is passive in form: if a monument is standing, then ostensibly it is being protected. I would think it would be better to say here: "preservation of cultural monuments." That is an active form of restoration. Of both preservation and restoration.

A.I. Lukyanov: You have a point; it's just that I'd prefer it not to be a long title, that's all.

R.N. Nishanov: Okay, your question please. You're next.

From the floor: What I want to raise is the title of the first commission, what you describe as the main one—that is, the Commission on Interethnic Relations. I support the deputy who said that the word "policy" is missing here. Indeed, in my view the phrase "interethnic relations" sounds merely like a fire extinguisher. I would propose the following: "Commission for Nationalities Policy and Interethnic Relations." Because in my view interethnic relations are, first, the result of policy.

A.I. Lukyanov: I was simply proceeding on the basis that, as a specialist on the state, I believe that here it is a question not of policy but of specific decisions.

M.S. Gorbachev: Of the law, of legislative activity.

A.I. Lukyanov: Of legislative activity. But in principle....

From the floor: Well, I don't know. I have another proposal about the committees. The Committee for Questions of Glasnost and Citizens' Rights and Appeals. I think our colleagues from the Soviet of the Union have already added the word "rights," or was it "glasnost"?

A.I. Lukyanov: "Glasnost."

From the floor: "Glasnost." I want to add one more word. If there are questions of glasnost and rights, I think the term ethics should also be added here. That is, the Committee for Questions of Glasnost, Ethics, and Citizens' Rights and Appeals. I think that wherever there is glasnost, there must be some kind of....

A.I. Lukyanov: Thank you. I want to answer you, comrades. This question arises every time, no matter how much we have discussed it in the Councils of Elders and the Soviet of the Union. Okay, an ethics committee. The congress has shown that this is an urgent question! Various parliaments abroad are creating so-called general committees or ethics committees. But most parliaments nevertheless entrust their presidiums—that is, chairmen and their deputies—with examining ethical questions. First, the two chambers often combine here. For the moment these questions have not flared up very acutely in our country, so to speak, and we have no need to set up a parliamentary police, as they do in some parliaments, so for the moment the examination of these questions could be left to the chairmen of the chambers and their deputies. And if this doesn't work out, we will create a special Ethics Committee.

R.N. Nishanov: You have a question, please go ahead. Sergey Aleksandrovich will be next.

D.A.A. Kerimov, chief of department at the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences, Moscow City (Shakhbuzskiy National-Territorial Electoral Okrug, Nakhichevan ASSR): Anatoliy Ivanovich! I will venture to return again to the question of culture. I feel

a kind of inner dissatisfaction. You're quite right that the Soviet of Nationalities must naturally have a Commission on Culture, on Language, and so forth. But, as someone has already correctly noted here, this is also of all-union significance. So I would propose a compromise solution. Keeping the commission in the form in which is now exists, but in the title of the Committee for Science and Public Education throwing out the last word, "upbringing," and replacing it with "culture." Upbringing a priori must be implemented everywhere.

A.I. Lukyanov: Just between ourselves, I can tell you that it was originally like that—the word "culture" was taken out.

R.N. Nishanov: Right, Sergey Aleksandrovich, please go ahead.

From the floor: I want you to give us an answer about the Committee for Defense and State Security Questions. I'd like to know your opinion. In many countries of the world it is customary for the defense minister to be a civilian. I think it would be good for the chairman of this committee in our country also to be without fail a civilian without military rank, and for the committee's membership also to include people without military ranks.

A.I. Lukyanov: I think this has been taken into account. If you want to know our opinion, we subscribe to a similar position.

R.N. Nishanov: Your question, please.

From the floor: I'm from Tajikistan. As a territorial deputy, I am a member of neither the Soviet of the Union nor the Soviet of Nationalities. I have been allowed to attend the sittings of the chamber. I have the following proposal: These committees have already been discussed in the Soviet of the Union, today we are discussing.... I think it makes no real difference if we move a word forward or back. We can change the titles in the process of our work.

A.I. Lukyanov: Of course.

From the floor: We can change the titles or form new commissions in the light of proposals submitted by comrades.

R.N. Nishanov: Okay, do you have a question or a proposal, please?

From the floor: I propose that it be approved.

R.N. Nishanov: Fine. We accept your proposal. Go ahead, please.

T.K. Ismailov, general director of the Azerbaijan SSR Academy of Sciences Space Research Science and Production Association, Baku City (Nakhichevanskiy National-Territorial Electoral Okrug, Azerbaijan SSR): Anatoliy Ivanovich, I suppose I have a philosophical question. A colleague who spoke here talked of a passive form of protection—protection in general, so to speak. I would like to develop this point a little. I think we do not always use this word correctly: As soon as discussion turns to health or any dynamic processes, we immediately employ it. But first we ought to create normal conditions for the functioning and development of the sphere. Then, in that process, a need for protection may arise. Take the Council of Ministers Committee for the Protection of the Environment, for instance. What's the point of protection? We should create conditions for the normal functioning of this committee, whereby protection will be just one of its functions. That is, the way in which the word "protection" is used must be active.

And we have a Committee for the Protection of the People's Health. But we must not protect the people's health, we must create conditions conducive to normal health. You know, I'm not a medic, but it is not a matter of diagnosis and treatment. I am simply asking that this question be considered—can the word "protection" be included in the titles of our committees and commissions when the use of it in a dynamic, functioning sense has been forgotten?

A.I. Lukyanov: I agree with you. But when we proposed calling this committee the "Committee for Public Health Protection," the medics exploded, saying: Public health is too narrow a concept (though, as you can see, the word "protection" features here too)—let's call it the "Committee for the Protection of the People's Health." That is, they wanted to embrace the whole range of problems—ecological, mother and child health protection, and so forth. This will really be protection of the people's health.

R.N. Nishanov: Right, your question, please.

From the floor: It ought to be called the Committee for Questions of the People's Health, the Committee for the Family, the Maternity Committee. Why "for the protection"?

A.I. Lukyanov: You know, what I would say to you is this: We have too many committees "for questions" and too few committees for answering them.

R.N. Nishanov: Your question, please.

S.U. Kallas, deputy editor of the newspaper RAHVA HAAL, Tallinn City (Rakvereskiy Severnyy National-Territorial Electoral Okrug, Estonian SSR): I have three short remarks. First, about the Committee for Questions of Glasnost and Citizens' Rights and Appeals. There are two aspects here: on the one hand the press and glasnost, on the other citizens' letters and appeals. Won't this be too much for one committee? Won't one aspect get overwhelmed by the other?

Second. Wouldn't it be advisable for us to set up a Commission To Formulate and Improve the Standing Orders and Procedure for the Work of the Supreme Soviet? After all, such a commission will work virtually constantly, because at every step we are all wasting time and we may get bogged down in these unsolved questions.

Third. Where will questions of space research end up? Which commission will deal with them?

R.N. Nishanov: Go ahead. You can submit proposals from the floor or from the rostrum.

I.O. Bisher, professor at the P. Stuchka Latvian State University, Riga City (Stuchkinskiy National-Territorial Electoral Okrug, Latvian SSR): Already at the sittings of the Councils of Elders and Soviet of the Union I have sensed a desire to create as many committees as we have problems in the country. But we certainly have a lot of problems, and we certainly don't have enough deputies for them. It has to be said that not all problems always have to be solved at the all-union level and necessarily by parliamentary methods. We must also take this into account. Thus, for instance, there has been a lot of talk of education here, which is clearly something that indeed we must not ignore. But probably we here will not be able to do for the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences what it has been unable to do so far for itself. So I think that we must proceed from the real functions entrusted to the Supreme Soviet and from the problems that we must solve without fail. And also from the real packages of proposals which we have already received and on which we are to work in the immediate future. The commissions and committees must be formed on the basis of all this. I think that the list of them is basically in line with reality.

At the same time I still want to raise here one question that several comrades have raised at the congress before me, and that has also been broached here. That is the question of ethics. I don't entirely agree with Anatoliy Ivanovich's assessment that everything is fine in our country in this regard. True, we have not yet come to blows, and, as he said, such committees have to be created where people have already come to blows. I think we should go further; we should prevent this. But at the same time there have already been a number of statements that certain deputies, organizations, and even entire union republics have seen as discrediting and slandering them. There have also been attempts to resolve such questions. But the way in which they have been resolved cannot be regarded as the optimum method. The method of resolving them was strongly reminiscent of the old Novgorod assembly: a question of who outdoes whom when it comes to shouting and applause. I think that this method is not altogether correct, that such questions must be precisely analyzed, and that each person must bear responsibility for what he says, whether he is a Hero of the Soviet Union or a hero of Afghanistan. If we want to demand that others display responsibility, first of all we must raise our own responsibility. And clearly we must have a method of resolving such questions. The proposal has been made here that they be referred for examination by the presidium. I think that it will have plenty of work even without that. I have no objection to one of the deputy chairmen of the chambers heading such a commission, but I believe that the presidium obviously should not be in the business of finding out where a particular deputy was in 1968—Czechoslovakia or the United States. Probably someone else should do this sort of thing.

I think that we must also formulate specific rules on ethical questions. As is well known, other parliaments in the world have quite detailed rules of this kind. They apply not only to remarks, but also to a number of other questions. We must not close our eyes to this. After all, we once believed that we needed no rules on ecology—everything was splendid in this sphere in our country—and that we needed no laws on combating the mafia, because it simply does not exist. But it subsequently emerged that we start feeding the dog only when the wolf is already among the sheep. That is a Lettish proverb.

I think that we ought to create right now a commission to formulate specific ethical rules and sanctions both regarding the aforementioned remarks and regarding other questions of deputies' conduct. For instance, I have now been included in the commission on a well-known case (I don't recall the commission's precise title) and I think that its members, too, should behave according to certain ethical rules. If we have such rules, it will be very useful.

Now for our internal standing orders. We have wasted a great deal of time at the congress because many questions of the standing orders were not formulated, and we have tried to resolve them directly at the congress. Clearly, we need to set up a special group to define all the principles of our activity: how commissions work, what their rights are, and so forth. This is a new task, of course, but a necessary one. I propose nevertheless that one more committee be created—for ethics and the standing orders.

R.N. Nishanov: There is food for thought there. Maybe we should confer with the chairmen of both chambers. How should this be organized? Perhaps we should submit a specific proposal tomorrow?

Please come up here. And I implore you, keep it brief. Just one minute per proposal, comrades.

From the floor: I think we're taking rather a strange approach to the creation of our commissions, that is, toward the content of their work, which is reflected in the title. For instance, the word "culture" was mentioned and we began (though no one had any objections) to wonder where it should be inserted. It doesn't seem to fit anywhere. Clearly, this is the wrong way to resolve this

question; we should not be wondering where to put this word. Culture is an exceptionally important matter. But we are trying to tack it on somewhere: maybe in this line, or maybe in that....

R.N. Nishanov: Do you have a proposal?

From the floor: Obviously culture merits a separate, independent committee. That is my proposal. Incidentally, the same thing happened with the word "glasnost." I am very grateful to our colleagues from the Soviet of the Union who mentioned this word when the question of committees came up. But there, too, a search immediately got under way: Where can we tack on glasnost? They found somewhere to "tack it on": the last committee, ahead of citizens' rights and appeals. The effect is rather eclectic. But you can find a connection, an interconnection between anything you like. Glasnost is such a broad and important concept (and this is precisely confirmed in the special resolution of the 19th party conference) that other equally important questions should not be "dragged in" and attached to it. Today glasnost needs to be developed, but it is in equal need of defense, because a definite attack is being mounted on it.

I propose that citizens' statements and appeals be transferred to the third committee—for questions of legislation, legality, and law and order. For citizens' appeals are precisely about violations of legality. So it will be appropriate here.

R.N. Nishanov: So let us proceed in order. Please. It will be your turn after this comrade.

B.Y. Palagnyukh, director of the 60th Anniversary of the USSR Pedigree Poultry Sovkhoz, Rybnitskiy Rayon (Rybnitskiy National-Territorial Okrug, Moldavian SSR): I submit a proposal to create a subcommission for language on the basis of two commissions: the Commission for Questions of the Development of Culture, Language, National and International Traditions, and Protection of Historical Monuments, and the Commission for Interethnic Relations. Why do I submit this proposal? In connection with the fact that the status of the state language which gave the republic its name has recently been adopted in a number of republics, including ours. But other nationalities also live in the republic, including a Russian-speaking population. Why do I want you to listen attentively to what I am about to read out to you? Talking in the spring of 1945 with the priest Morelli and with Washington's representative in Switzerland, Allen Dulles, the leader of U.S. intelligence, said: It is a ludicrous venture to send saboteurs into the future Russia to blow up plants. But if our propaganda proves in a precise and well-reasoned way to Russia's nationalities that each of them can exist and converse only in its own language, this will be our victory and the Russians will be powerless to counteract this victory. Yulian Semenov, "The Position," volume 1, page 144.

This problem affects not only our republic. It affects the Baltic republics and other republics. A Russian-speaking population of inside 80 million lives in the republics, and so I consider it necessary to create a subcommission for language precisely within the Interethnic Relations Commission, and to give Russian the status of a state language. It must, of course, be protected. Vladimir Ilich Lenin once said: Of course, there is no need to decree the Russian language, for it will itself find its road and take its place. Yes, it did find its road and take its place. But now such relations are taking shape: When republics give their own languages the status of a state language, the Russian-speaking population remains outside the language. Therefore, on behalf of deputies from a number of republics, more than 25 people signed an appeal which I wish to read out and pass on to the congress. We consider it necessary to give Russian the status of a state language. This is very important for us. I myself am Ukrainian, but, I repeat, some people have already had their say here today and earlier—esteemed Comrade Oleynik and esteemed Comrade Drutse. One spoke of duplicity, ashamed to speak of bilingualism and the great Russian language. But others, when preparing USSR laws, do not even mention in the draft the Russian language, in which the majority of the USSR's peoples converse, the language of our interethnic communication.

R.N. Nishanov: I apologize, comrades. I feel that we are digressing from the agenda. One moment. Hear me out, I will let you speak, just wait. We are digressing from the agenda. We will be in session much longer, and every time we must adhere to a definite agenda. This is the first point. Second, I ask the speakers to have their say specifically on these questions, and then we will vote. Third, we will work until 2030. At 2030 we will end our session.

From the floor: I propose forming a subcommittee for inventions within the Committee for Science, Public Education, and Upbringing, and calling the committee itself the Committee for Science, Technology, Public Education, and Upbringing.

R.N. Nishanov: Your question, please. You may approach the microphone.

R.G. Salukvadze, director of Sukhumi I.N. Vekua Physicotechnical Institute (Sukhumskiy-Leninskiy National-Territorial Electoral Okrug, Abkhaz ASSR): I propose—not just for the sake of an alternative, but as a matter of principle—creating independently a Committee for Science. I say this because science has recently found itself in straitened circumstances in connection with the transfer of sectoral science to economic accountability and the upcoming transfer of academy science also to economic accountability. Sectoral institutes are suffering in particular today from the viewpoint of the development of fundamental research. I believe that VUZ science, which receives far less from sectoral science, is already suffering no less today. Therefore I believe that there are no grounds today for saying that science is a sector of

culture or the economy. Science, as I said long ago, although this did not happen in reality, is a sector and it must be a foremost sector. And we will not bring science into foremost positions just by acquiring licenses and "knowhow" or by creating joint ventures. Therefore, for fundamental science to develop properly, it is necessary to create a committee with a special status.

R.N. Nishanov: Your turn, please. Comrade Likhanov will be next.

A.I. Dubko, chairman of the "Progress" Agro-Industrial Kolkhoz-Combine, Grodnenskiy Rayon, Grodno Oblast (from the kolkhozes united in the Union Kolkhoz Council): First of all, allow me to say, Rafik Nishanovich, that you, too, are to blame because our work is taking a long time. The standing orders should have been defined at once when you were elected.

R.N. Nishanov: We will take account of this.

A.I. Dubko: And the second point. Anyone who read the recent statement by the FRG ambassador to the Soviet Union will remember that he said: Prior to 1956 the Germans engaged not in politics but in economics. Today we are all endeavoring to be politicians and are working very badly in economics. As a result, even today I alone am speaking for the kolkhozes.

Specifically—the Committee for Agrarian Questions that is proposed for the Supreme Soviet in no way satisfies us. We approach again with our yardstick, for agricultural affairs virtually remain at the same level as before. Or still worse. That is, in practice this committee will not protect us, and the three people who will be working just won't be able to keep on top of things.

Therefore we still insist on our solution: It must be a working committee, and when elaborating questions it must report to the government its agreement or disagreement. Thank you for your attention. In other respects we probably have no need to complicate matters unnecessarily. We said at the beginning that a commission is not frozen dogma. They will be developed and perfected. We will not find a prescription for all eventualities in life today.

R.N. Nishanov: Comrade Likhanov. Then you, Comrade Rakhimova.

A.A. Likhanov, writer, chairman of the board of the V.I. Lenin Soviet Children's Fund (from the V.I. Lenin Soviet Children's Fund): Comrade women and men! I address the men in particular. And as such I address precisely you, comrade deputies. Statistics attest that our entire productive labor in the course of a year amounts to approximately 200 billion man-hours. And, of course, a large share of this belongs to women. In addition, statistics assert that housework takes up in excess of a further 100-billion man-hours. And all of this is shouldered by women. In some regions today, so sociologists claim, a woman spends approximately 20 minutes a day bringing up children. And in some regions even less. So, comrade men, let us finally try to share with the women responsibility for the family, for children. Why have we again lumped together, so to speak, such categories as women's affairs and protection of the family, mother, and child? This is a colossal business, a colossal affair. And again we are thinking in the old way.

Incidentally, I tell you, this question already has quite a long history. And we, the Children's Fund, put forward this proposal on the eve of the congress. And we are continuing to do so.

Anatoliy Ivanovich! After the sitting of the Soviet of the Union and, when this information came, this morning, almost 200 deputies put their suggestions to the secretariat. To agree, all the same, to this idea of ours. For it is a good, noble, restructuring idea. Let us create two committees: a Committee for Women's Affairs and a Committee To Defend the Interests of Families and Children. I earnestly beg you to support my proposal.

R.N. Nishanov: We will approach these questions when preparing proposals. It must be borne in mind that the Soviet of the Union approved these committees with amendments and comments. Of course, we have the right to make our own suggestions, but the aforesaid must be borne in mind. Comrade Rakhimova, please. You wished to speak? Comrade Rakhimova next.

From the floor: Still it seems to me that the Commission for Consumer Goods, Trade, and Municipal, Consumer, and Other Services to the Population is, nonetheless, on a republic, oblast, and local level. There seems to me no need to create it. On the other hand, I see no other commission that will examine general principles relating to problems of economic accountability, as well as the materials submitted by the Baltic republics. Which commission will examine problems of republic economic accountability, Anatoliy Ivanovich? The commission for reform?

A.I. Lukyanov: For economic reform.

From the floor: And the third point. People here have spoken of ethics. What kind of ethics, comrades? When the congress gave a tumultuous ovation blaspheming those who died 9 April and insulting the soul of the Georgian nation and human conscience in general? What kind of ethics?

R.N. Nishanov: Deputy Rakhimova, please. We now give the floor to the women.

B. Rakhimova, secretary of Leninabad Tajik Communist Party Obkom (from the women's councils united in the Committee of Soviet Women): Today we have been discussing the creation of a Commission for Questions of Socioeconomic Development and Interethnic Relations in the chamber of the Soviet of Nationalities. I believe

that this is perfectly correct. It must be precisely in the nationalities chamber, because many of our interethnic problems are associated precisely with the failure to resolve socioeconomic questions. I wish to raise one problem in this connection.

I realize that maybe this question should have been raised at the congress. But taking advantage of the opportunity to speak here, I would like to say this. Comrades, virtually the entire history of the development of our country and of our republic in particular, and maybe of the whole of Central Asia, testifies that throughout the time of stagnation, before and after that period, the state capital investments allocated for social, cultural, and consumer service projects were kept to an absolute minimum. It is no accident that our republic is the only one to run a three-shift system of teaching in schools. Only 4 percent of children in our republic attend preschool institutions, there is a shortage of maternity homes, and we have the highest mother and infant mortality rate. Let me tell you bluntly, comrades, that the mortality indicator—45 per 1,000—is double the average for the Soviet Union. I believe that this is a tragedy. Therefore in the commission where we will discuss socioeconomic development—and all regions are now switching to self-financing—we must take into account the starting position of the republics and regions switching to self-financing. In this context, and in order to equalize conditions, I believe that our chamber, or maybe the Supreme Soviet, should have a corresponding state fund which would be used to equalize conditions in our regions, primarily in Central Asia, and maybe even in Kazakhstan.

I wish to raise another question. Comrades, there was talk of women's problems here today. We are setting up a Commission for Women's Affairs and Mother and Child Protection. I support Comrade Likhanov's statement to the effect that mother and child protection would be better assigned to the Commission for Protection of the People's Health. After all, mothers and children are also part of the people. And then, comrades, women's problems are very specific. Therefore I believe that, at worst, the Commission for Women's Affairs should have a subcommission for problems of mother and child protection specifically in Central Asian regions.

And one last wish addressed to our chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities chamber—I already mentioned this at the Council of Elders, in which I took part. I realize that now we have had democratic elections and we women, bluntly speaking, have lost, because now there are only one-half as many of us as there were in the Supreme Soviet previously. But let us, now that we have so many wonderful women in the chamber—maybe we were acting according to the principle 'better fewer but better'—let us elect one woman as deputy chairman of our chamber from among these, the best of our women. (Applause).

R.N. Nishanov: I beg your pardon, but we have only 5 minutes left, you are the last one to speak, and then let us consult. We will have further sittings.

L.I. Batynskaya, editor of the newspaper KRASNOYARSKIY KOMSOMOLETS, RSFSR, Krasnoyarsk City (From the USSR Journalists Union): I would really urge the esteemed deputies and the chairman to support me and my journalist colleagues in the view that it is necessary to set up in the USSR Supreme Soviet a Committee on Questions of Glasnost and the Mass Media on a basis of parity between the two chambers. Questions of the mass media are questions of content, structure, technical issues, journalists' rights, and society's rights in the face of the mass media.

Speakers from the congress rostrum have come up with various similes for our democracy and glasnost. I'm not going to add to this series of images; let me say only that glasnost—even today, in the 5th year of restructuring—is still being divided into central and regional. The degree of the latter depends on the regional leader's personality and the editor's ability to stand up to pressure from various officials. I am convinced that as the power of soviets expands and strengthens, their leadership of the press will be transformed from a formality to a reality.

If the esteemed deputies do not find it possible to set up such a committee—which we journalists will really regret—we would ask that the words "mass media" be placed in the following context: Committee for Questions of Glasnost, the Mass Media, and Citizens' Rights and Appeals. Thank you.

R.N. Nishanov: Please, your question. I apologize, of course, for commenting on the fly, but a Law on the Press is due to be adopted, and many questions will be solved there, comrades. Please go ahead.

From the floor: We all lack brevity and precision. I want to make a specific proposal.

I believe that the first commission ought to be called Commission for Interethnic Relations and the Development of Culture, Language, and National and International Traditions. All this is interlinked.

The second commission, in my view, ought to be called the Commission for Matters of the Development of Union and Autonomous Republics and Autonomous Oblasts and Okrugs and Protection of Historical and Cultural Heritage.

And the Commission for Consumer Goods and Trade, I think, ought to be given a different name. Let us get away from this stereotype and call it Commission for Protection of Consumer Rights and Improvement of the Quality of Services and Output.

Finally, there is an opportunity to form another commission which is lacking—a Commission for the Affairs of Voluntary and Unsponsored Societies, Associations, and Social Self-Management Organs.

A few proposals concerning the committees: I believe, as an architect by profession, that the Committee for Construction and Architecture Questions ought to be named Committee for Questions of Construction, Architecture, and Organization of the Habitat.

The Committee for Women's Affairs and Family, Mother, and Child Protection, I think, would be more aptly named Committee for the Defense of Childhood Rights, Protection of Motherhood, and Women's and Family Affairs.

And the last committee. Instead of "Glasnost and Citizens' Appeals" it should be named Committee for the Defense of Citizens' Rights and Appeals and the Study of Public Opinion.

R.N. Nishanov: One moment, comrades. I don't think that this is our last sitting, and we will have further opportunities to say everything. Let me voice a few considerations. Keep your seats for a minute or so. After all, this is not our last sitting.

First. Many proposals merit serious attention. Like the proposal on ethics, for example. I will consult the chairman of the Soviet of the Union and we will draft a proposal on this question. We will examine this matter at one of our sittings in the near future.

Second. A number of proposals submitted here merit attention. But maybe in order not to overextend the list of our committees and their titles, we should take a series of these proposals—which are really pressing—into account when subcommittees or commissions are being set up. We will certainly inform you of the form in which we intend to do this. Now, on the basis of this broad exchange of opinions, I would like to propose three amendments for your attention.

Among the standing commissions of the Soviet of Nationalities, that the Commission on Interethnic Relations, which was proposed to be set up first, be named Commission for Nationalities Policy and Interethnic Relations.

That the final part of the title of the commission which talks about historical monuments be as follows: International Traditions, and Protection of Historical Heritage. This covers these matters on a broader basis.

Since many deputies here urged that the committee's title include the term "culture," maybe we ought to set up a Committee for Science, Public Education, Culture, and Upbringing.

We have thus taken the more global proposals into account.

From the floor: A subcommittee for invention work.

R.N. Nishanov: And a subcommittee for invention work. That was on the fly. Just a moment, Comrade Gamkrelidze. Here we have a deputy who asked for 1 minute, please let me give him the floor and we'll call it a day. Please, let us adhere to the standing orders.

From the floor: As far I can make out, four commissions will be set up—no more and no less. Absolutely nothing about agriculture; there is not a single word in our national commissions. Look, what are we going to protect, sell, and enjoy if there is absolutely nothing about agriculture? You see—the most important point—we could still add to the Commission on Questions of Social and Economic Development, if we cannot set up a new commission or eliminate one, something about land use. At least this question. No, it will not go away, it will indeed not go away. There is a committee, but there is no commission. My proposal: We should nonetheless include the question of land use in this commission.

R.N. Nishanov: There have been several proposals on this question. Just one moment, we have given the floor to the last comrade. Just one moment. Comrade Gamkrelidze, please.

T.V. Gamkrelidze: I have a remark to make on your proposal. Language is disappearing from the commission's title. Your wording for the commission no longer contains the word "language."

From the floor: Language is there.

T.V. Gamkrelidze: Which commission says language? You have reworded it so that there is no language.

R.N. Nishanov: I read aloud only the final part of the proposal, not the beginning. Here we are: We have a Commission for Questions of the Development of Culture, Language, National and International Traditions, and Protection of the Historical Heritage.

T.V. Gamkrelidze: So everything stays the way it was.

R.N. Nishanov: Of course. In this form. So, comrades, we'll do some more work together, we'll work things out, questions may arise, and so on. Now the last proposal. It was made several times. We have a Committee for Agrarian Questions and Food. This covers all agricultural questions. We shall consult with the Soviet of the Union chamber over whether or not to include land use, and we'll inform you of our views later.

Many thanks for your active participation. The next sitting will be the USSR Supreme Soviet's sitting tomorrow at 1000, in this hall. Goodbye.